

Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani *De Anima*

Supplements
to
Vigiliae Christianae

Texts and Studies of
Early Christian Life and Language

Editors

J. den Boeft – Bart D. Ehrman – J. van Oort
D.T. Runia – C. Scholten – J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 100

Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani *De Anima*

By
J.H. Waszink



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978 9004 16904 3

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Brill has made all reasonable efforts to trace all right holders to any copyrighted material used in this work. In cases where these efforts have not been successful the publisher welcomes communications from copyright holders, so that the appropriate acknowledgements can be made in future editions, and to settle other permission matters.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Brief Overview of J.H. Waszink's Scholarly Career	ix
Introduction	xiii
Text of the Original Edition <i>Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani</i> <i>DE ANIMA</i> , edited with Introduction and Commentary	1
Errata to the original edition	653

PREFACE

The *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* series was launched in 1987 with the publication of Tertullianus, *De Idololatria*, a critical text with translation and commentary by J.H. Waszink and J.C.M. van Winden (partly based on a manuscript left behind by P.G. van der Nat). It seems appropriate, therefore, that the 100th volume to appear in the *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* series should be an updated reprint of J.H. Waszink's monumental and authoritative edition of Tertullian's *De Anima*. This volume contains the complete contents of the first edition, to which we have added a brief overview of J.H. Waszink's scholarly career, an English translation of the greater part of the introduction to his German translation of *De Anima* of 1980 and a list of corrections authorized by him. We would like to thank Brill for its active cooperation.

J. den Boeft
E.P. Meijering
J.C.M. van Winden

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF J.H. WASZINK'S SCHOLARLY CAREER (1908–1990)

Jan Hendrik Waszink was born on 27 October 1908 in the Netherlands in Renswoude, where his father was a general practitioner. The family later moved to Delft, where he was educated at the local grammar school. Waszink went on to study classics at Leiden University and completed his studies in 1933 with his dissertation *Tertullian, De Anima mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Two years later, he added the *Index verborum et locutionum quae Tertulliani De anima libro continentur*. Important and impressive as his achievement was, it proved to be only a preliminary version of the definitive English edition and commentary of *De Anima* published in 1947.

Throughout his life, Waszink remained devoted to the study of Tertullian, producing articles and reviews, but also an edition of the *Adversus Hermogenem* (Utrecht 1956), accompanied by an English translation (London 1956). In 1980, he returned to *De Anima* with an annotated translation in German. An English translation of a large part of the introduction has been incorporated in the present reprint. In 1987, together with J.C.M. van Winden he published an edition with commentary of *De Idololatria*, which completed the work of the late P.G. van der Nat, one of his pupils.

Waszink started his professional career as a grammar school teacher, but, in 1946, he was appointed Professor of Latin at Leiden University. This enabled him to give full scope to his accomplishments in classical philology, ancient philosophy and patristics. His great interest in patristics was inspired by the seminars of F.J. Dölger, whose integrated study of 'Antike und Christentum' impressed him as much as the example set by great Latinists like Heinze and Norden in the study of Latin literature. He lectured and published on a wide range of authors, from Ennius to Boethius, but two names stand out in his scholarly work. After Tertullian, the edition of Calcidius' translation (with a philosophical commentary) of the first half of Plato's *Timaeus* became the second great enterprise of his life. The edition was published in 1962 and reprinted with some addenda in 1975.

Waszink's profound occupation with classical authors and the textual tradition of their works also led to his professional interest in the human-

ist movement. In 1951, he published a booklet on Petrarch in Dutch and in his lectures he paid ample attention to the classical tradition through the ages. When the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences decided to produce a scholarly edition of Erasmus' *Opera Omnia*, he participated actively in the project, both as a member of the editorial board and as an editor of some of Erasmus' works, including *Lingua*, which was published a year before Waszink's death on 5 October 1990.

This reprint of Tertullianus *De Anima* appears in the series of 'supplements' to *Vigiliae Christianae*, the review founded in 1946 by four comparatively young scholars: Christine Mohrmann (1903–1988), Gilles Quispel (1916–2006), Willem van Unnik (1910–1978) and Jan Waszink.

Waszink's 'Tertullianea' can be found in his 'Scriptorum Elenchus' on p. IX to XXV of his *Opuscula Selecta* (Leiden 1979), which lists all his publications until 1977. His contributions to Tertullian studies after this year are the following:

'Osservazioni sul *De testimonio animae* di Tertulliano', in: R. Cantalamessa, L.F. Pizzolato (eds), *Paradoxos Politeia. Studi patristici in onore di G. Lazzati* (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 10). Milan 1979, 178–184.

'Tertullian's Principles and Methods of Exegesis', in: W.R. Schoedel, R.L. Wilken (eds), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: in honorem Robert M. Grant*. Paris 1979, 9–31.

Tertullian Über die Seele. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert von Jan H. Waszink. Zürich and Munich 1980 (reprinted in 1986).

Review of Tertullien, *A son épouse*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes de Charles Munier (Sources Chrétiennes 273). Paris, 1980, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981) 290–298.

(With J.C.M. van Winden) 'A Particular Kind of Idolatry. An Exegesis of Tertullian, *De idololatria* ch. 23' in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982) 15–23.

(With J.C.M. van Winden) Tertullianus, *De idololatria*. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 1). Leiden 1987.

Review of Tertullien, *Les spectacles*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire de Marie Turcan (Sources Chrétiennes 332). Paris, 1986, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988) 83–85.

Review of Tertullien, *Le mariage unique*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire de Paul Mattei (Sources Chrétiennes 343). Paris, 1988, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990) 394–395.

See further the 'In memoriam J.H. Waszink' in *Gnomon* 63 (1991) 660–663.

INTRODUCTION

In 1980, Artemis Verlag published J.H. Waszink's annotated German translation of *De Anima*. The German introduction bears witness to the translator's view on Tertullian's accomplishments and his place within the development of Latin literature in Antiquity. For this reason, it was decided to add an English translation of the greater part of the German introduction to this reprint. A few passages were omitted as they duplicated the introduction from 1947. The text has intentionally not been updated and represents Waszink's own ideas.

There is very little information about the life of Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus and about the chronological sequence of the thirty-one surviving works from his pen. Again and again, we realize that we simply do not have the material that would allow us to write a real biography, such as is perfectly possible with figures like Jerome, Ambrose, and *a fortiori* Augustine. The exceptional scantiness of this information is of course a consequence of the fact that Tertullian parted company with the traditional church in his thirties and forties, and joined the sect of Montanus, where he certainly was a priest. Later, he turned his back on this sect too and founded a community of his own in Carthage, which bore the name *Tertullianistae* after its founder. We know nothing of the history of this sect, and it is possible that it sank into insignificance after Tertullian's death, although it was only in the fifth century, probably thanks to specific endeavors on the part of Augustine, that it returned to the official church. The inclusion of all of Tertullian's writings in the list of the prohibited books in the decree of Pope Gelasius in 494 dealt the deathblow to the tradition about Tertullian's life and literary activity. Only a very few writers in Christian antiquity were genuinely well acquainted with Tertullian's writings (with the exception of his *Apologeticum*, which at once became celebrated). The first of these is Cyprian. According to his biographer Pontius, he used to say *Da magistrum* ("Hand me the Master!") when he wished to consult Tertullian's writings, which he probably knew in their entirety. We should also mention Jerome, who borrowed from him many felicitous expressions and formulations which were appropriate in one way or another; and Augustine, who however referred much more often than Jerome to the content of Tertullian's writings. In my investigations of the subsequent influence of the treatise *On the Soul*, I discovered fairly numerous literary borrowings in the sermons of Bishop

Zeno of Verona (died 371 / 372), who like Tertullian came from North Africa, and in the great preacher Peter Chrysologus (ca. 380–450; archbishop of Ravenna from 431).

Tertullian was born to pagan parents in the province of Africa Con-sularis. The three provinces in the Atlas region (Mauritania, Numidia, and Africa Proconsularis, roughly identical to the modern states of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia) had a strong sense of common national and cultural bonds, which we shall discuss below. After his conversion, he settled in Carthage. His detailed knowledge of technical expressions of Roman civil law (and the even more numerous technical expressions of rhetoric) strongly suggests that he worked in Carthage as an advocate (*patronus* or *causidicus*). It is however more than improbable that he is identical to the legal scholar Tertullianus, who was one of the outstanding *iuris prudentes* of the imperial period, as we see from the mention of two of his writings, viz. eight Books of *Quaestiones* and a monograph *De castrensi peculio*, in the *Digesta* or *Pandectae*, a thematically ordered collection of quotations from the most prominent legal scholars in Rome, such as Papinian and Ulpian. We must accept the conclusion of T.D. Barnes¹ that although Tertullian had a considerable knowledge of Roman law, this did not go beyond what was taught at a good school of rhetoric. A great legal scholar had to work *sine ira et studio* on the development of the structure of Roman law, and Tertullian was utterly unsuited to such a work.

Tertullian was thus not a creative legal scholar. He was above all a rhetor, an apologist, a theologian, and of course a great writer.

After important preliminary research by J. Lortz and other scholars, the recent monographs by J.-Cl. Fredouille and R.D. Sider have demonstrated how strongly Tertullian was attached to rhetoric not only in his formulations, but also in the construction of his writings.² In fact, Tertullian put his rhetorical training into practice to such an extent that one might be tempted to see rhetoric as the completely dominant element in his work; and several scholars have not escaped this danger.

Erasmus noticed the pre-eminent role of rhetoric and the sarcasm and irony in Tertullian's writings, after his attention had been drawn to

¹ T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1971, 22–29.

² J. Lortz, *Tertullian als Apologet*, 2 vols., 1927–1928; J.-Cl. Fredouille, *Tertullien et la conversion de la culture antique*, 1972; R.D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*, 1971.

Tertullian by two of the three editions by his friend Beat Bilt (Beatus Rhenanus).³ For example, in his *Ecclesiastes*, published one year before his death (1536), he writes about Tertullian: *Durus est, tametsi salsus in confutandis haereticis, nasutus in traducendis vitiis, in quo optarim illum interdum longius abesse a scurillitate, sed Afer est*.⁴ One must however always bear in mind that Tertullian's remarks, which are often accompanied by rhetorical fireworks, are always based on an absolutely solid conviction of faith and that they ultimately serve either to clarify or to defend an article of faith.⁵ In this context, it is interesting to note that when the great French theologian and preacher Bossuet (1627–1704), a man with an unparalleled experiential knowledge of both the power and the limitations of Christian eloquence, mentions Tertullian, he calls him several times *le grave Tertullien*.⁶ Bossuet refers here to the serious character of Tertullian's theology. In more recent times, this has also been emphasized by A. d'Alès in the book *La théologie de Tertullien* (3rd edn. Paris 1905; it has recently been reprinted, after more than seventy years) and by H. von Campenhausen in the relevant section of his fundamental monograph *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (Tübingen 1968, 318–337).

Tertullian's religious conviction revolves around a limited number of dogmas: basically, these are the most important (or rather, those Tertullian judges to be the most important) of the articles of faith contained in the *regula fidei*. Here,⁷ we mention first his trinitarian doctrine, which is strikingly advanced and is formulated in very sharp terms, e.g. in *Adversus Praxean* 25: *Connexus Patris et Filii in Paracleto [= Spiritu Sancto] tres efficit cohaerentes, alterum ex altero. Qui tres unum sunt, non unus*. The term *persona* is found for the first time in *Adversus Praxean* 12: *Alium ... personae, non substantiae nomen, ad distinctionem, non ad divisionem* ("for the sake of distinguishing, not for the sake of separating"). We should also mention the doctrine of the two natures of Christ. In *Adversus Praxean* 27, Tertullian affirms clearly: *Duplicem statum, non confusum, sed coniunctum in una persona, deum et hominem Iesum*. (In this connection, Tertullian sometimes used the verb *miscere*, which can

³ Erasmus knew the first two editions of Tertullian by Beatus Rhenanus (1521 and 1528); the third appeared in 1539, after Erasmus' death.

⁴ S.L. Greenslade, "Erasmus and Tertullian," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1975), 37–40.

⁵ Lortz is particularly inadequate in his presentation of this aspect.

⁶ For this quotation, I am indebted to the book by d'Alès, 498.

⁷ For a good overview of the most important doctrines for Tertullian, cf. B. Altaner, *Patrologie*, 8th edn. by A. Stuiber, 1978, 160–163.

mislead us, e.g. in *Adv. Marc.* 2.27: *in filio . . . miscente in semetipso deum et hominem*. But *miscere* here simply means *unire*.)⁸

We should also mention his conviction of the complete reliability of the apostolic tradition, which is the basis of the thorough presentation especially in *De praescriptione haereticorum*, and on which he relies for the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and of the last judgment (see *Anim.* 33, 55, and 58). Tertullian displays a particular interest in some themes, and his views became ever stricter as time went on. This applies especially to his teaching about repentance and about everything connected with the “single marriage.”

Tertullian’s repeated discussions of the human soul are particularly characteristic. He attaches great importance to the doctrine of the “natural Christianity” of the soul “in its essence as it actually is,” to the “testimony of the soul which is naturally Christian” (*testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae*), which is discussed first in ch. 17 of the *Apologeticum*, no doubt in reaction to Varro’s *Theologia tripertita*,⁹ then in the brief monograph *The Testimony of the Soul*, and finally in ch. 41 of the treatise *On the Soul*. Secondly, we must mention here Tertullian’s discussion of the origin of the soul. It took a long time before there was an ecclesiastically defined position on this question. In his endeavor to refute the heretical views especially of the Platonizing Valentinians and of Hermogenes on this question, and thanks to his own general interest in a theme which had been discussed in detail by Philo, Justin, and Irenaeus before him—a theme which must always be taken up in the interpretation of Gen 2:7—Tertullian devoted intensive intellectual energy (first in *Adversus Marcionem* 2.9–12, then in *De testimonio animae* and in *De anima* 11) to the elaboration of the thesis that the human soul is a “weaker breath” of the breath of life which is blown by God into Adam’s face. As he himself puts it, the soul is an *aurula spiritus* or a *flatus ex spiritu factus* (this is the distinction drawn by Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5.12.2, between the πνοή, the soul according to Gen 2:7 LXX, and the πνεῦμα).

We must mention one final basic conviction held by Tertullian which is completely incompatible with the “rule of faith,” i.e. the official teaching of the church. This is the teaching that everything that exists is a

⁸ On this, see my note to *Anim.* 45.3.

⁹ On this, cf. especially G. Lieberg, “Die theologia tripertita in Forschung und Bezeugung,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Festschrift for Joseph Voigt) I, 4, 1973, 63–115. Cf. also Idem, “Varros Theologie im Urteil Augustins,” *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, 1972, III, 185 ff.; J.H. Waszink, “Varrone nella letteratura cristiana dei primi secoli,” *Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi Varroniani*, 1976, I, 209–223.

body, although (as he often underlines) a *corpus sui generis* (thus, e.g. in *On the Flesh of Christ*). In keeping with this position, God too is described as a body, “although he is also spirit (*spiritus*)” (*Adv. Prax.* 7). The term *corporalitas*, “bodiliness,” was not a happy choice; probably, all that Tertullian meant here was “substantiality.” This *corporalitas* is now ascribed to the soul in the Stoic manner (*Anim.* 5–9); here too, however, he basically means something else, viz. the “materiality”—this, of course, is polemic against Platonic and heretical (especially Valentinian) theories about immaterial substances. However, this imprecise (or better: as yet very elementary) terminology led Tertullian to ascribe expressly bodily attributes to the soul: it is transmitted in the bodily act of procreation (this is known as “traducianism”: on this, cf. *Anim.* 19) and possesses color (*Anim.* 9). This position collapses completely in the discussion of the growth of the soul. Although he has just affirmed that the soul grows together with the body, Tertullian now states that “the growth of the soul does not refer to its substance, but allows the predispositions contained in the soul to emerge (gradually)” (*Ita et crementa animae reputanda: non substantiva, sed provocativa*). At first sight, this is an impressive antithesis, but when we look at it more closely, we see that it is merely rhetorical. In this context, a marginal note by Augustine in his *De Genesi ad litteram* 10.25.41 (the “literal exegesis of the Book of Genesis,” a great work in every sense) is very interesting: *Denique Tertullianus, quia corpus esse animam credidit, non ob aliud nisi quod eam incorpoream cogitare non potuit, et ideo timuit, ne nihil esset, si corpus non esset, nec de Deo valuit aliter sapere* [*Adv. Prax.* 7]: *qui sane quoniam acutus est, interdum contra opinionem suam visa veritate superatur*. (Here, Augustine may be thinking of the concluding sentence of *Anim.* 37, which has just been cited and which he himself quotes, *ibid.* 26.44.)

On this point, however, more remains to be said. If Tertullian developed and retained the habit (to borrow Bossuet’s fine words) of *corporaliser les choses divines*, this was not only because, as Augustine says, he “was unable to think of the soul as bodiless.” This was also the fruit of an act of his will: he was unwilling to allow the real concrete things, both in life and in nature and also in the affirmations of the faith, to be deprived of their own individual essence by philosophical interventions—and for Tertullian, this is practically identical with heretical interventions—either by leveling them down or by dematerializing them. In his view, this could lead only to a *phantasma*, something that existed only in appearance. He best expressed this opposition to “the tyranny of abstraction

and of generalization,” which he maintained throughout his life, in the most careful description of philosophy which is found in his works, viz. in chapter 2 of his treatise *On the Soul*. This text reads as follows: *Formas rebus imponit, eas nunc peraequat* [“treats them as equal”], *nunc privat* [“treats them as something that exists autonomously”], *de certis incerta praeiudicat, provocat ad exempla, quasi comparanda sint omnia, omnia praescribit, proprietatibus etiam inter similia diversis, nihil divinae licentiae servat, leges naturae opiniones suas fecit*. One may say that the words *formas rebus imponit* and *leges naturae opiniones suas fecit* contain in a nutshell Tertullian’s entire attitude to philosophy.

Tertullian’s theological activity, although undertaken with great seriousness, did not have anything like the importance for later centuries of the work of a Hilary or an Ambrose—to say nothing of an Augustine. It is also striking that while Lactantius, who wrote one of the earliest positive descriptions of the Christian faith in his *Divinae institutiones* (AD 304–313), has frequent recourse to Minucius Felix and Cyprian (including some pseudo-Cyprianic texts), all that he takes over from Tertullian is the doctrine of the “testimony of the soul.” Nor does he take this over directly, but only via the mediation of Minucius Felix. And like the others mentioned above, Lactantius too was a North African (Jerome, *Vir. Ill.* 80).

After we have spoken of Tertullian the rhetor and theologian, we must now speak of the writer. In order to explain the greatness of his achievement in this field, some preliminary remarks are necessary.

After a classicistic style both for prose and for most of the genres of poetry had been created in the last years of the republic and under the reign of Augustus, the further development in literature led to a great variety of stylistic levels. First, we have the style of the epic poets of the Neronian-Flavian period (AD 54–86), who increasingly opened the doors of poetry to rhetoric, as we can see in the epics of Lucan,¹⁰ Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus, until Statius in the *Thebais* and the *Achilleis* created something very eccentric—and thus very fatiguing for the reader—through a combination of exaggeration and sophistry. We also have the looser, very simple style which Ovid employed, and which

¹⁰ Cf. the well known verdict by Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 10.1.90) on Lucan: *Ut dicam, quod sentiam, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*. On Lucan and the other literary personages mentioned here, cf. the relevant articles in the *Lexikon der Alten Welt*, Zurich 1965 and in *Der kleine Pauly*, Stuttgart 1964–1975.

often seems very modern. Here, the relaxed elegance of Callimachus' narrative tone is not so much imitated as apparently continued—though only apparently; if I am not much mistaken, we can apply here what Paul Valéry¹¹ said about the narratives of Lafontaine (himself a great admirer of Ovid!): *L'absence de l'art est le comble de l'art*. This “modern” style now makes its way into prose literature, and it can be found most clearly and attractively in two collections of letters which lend themselves extraordinarily well to translation into modern languages: the Letters of Seneca and of Pliny the Younger. A third example is the dialogue *De Oratoribus* by the young Tacitus,¹² where the classical, very highly developed style of Cicero's three books *De oratore* is tempered, so to speak, by its convergence with the clear modern prose style which gives the impression of effortlessness, especially in the speeches of Aper, who has no very high opinion of tradition. It is my impression that in all the history of the development of Latin, it never develops more strongly in the direction of the modern languages than in these works I have mentioned here.

This very positive development lasted for only a short time. As early as the period of the Flavian emperors (AD 69–86), a certain rigidity sets in as a result of the ever increasing endeavor to “imitate” (*imitatio*) the great masters of the “Golden Age” (*aetas aurea*). Quintilian, the leading professor of rhetoric in this period, presents Cicero as the unsurpassed ideal of eloquence and of prose style (as is well known, *eloquentia* had both these meanings) and observes that everyone who found great delight in Cicero's writings is entitled to the conviction that he has made great progress (*Ille se multum profecisse scito, cui Cicero valde placebit*). This observation is entirely correct, since it is much more laborious than is commonly assumed to understand the tremendous progress that Latin prose made in and through Cicero's work, and especially through the realization of the ideal of *concinnitas*, the harmony in the structure of the whole and in the relationship of the whole to its parts. This can most easily be grasped if one compares the rough sentences of Cicero's contemporary Varro with the construction of the sentences in the treatise *De oratore* or the orations *Pro Sestio* and *Pro Milone*. Here, however, Quintilian—whose own style makes in fact a more modern impression than that of Cicero—has dislodged this effortless and supple way of writing Latin

¹¹ “Au sujet d'Adonis,” in *Variété*, ed. Gallimard, 56.

¹² I am convinced that the *Dialogus* of Tacitus was composed before the reign of Domitian, when Quintilian dominated rhetoric.

prose from its position as an ideal, and has assigned this position to the above-mentioned “imitation of the Golden Age.” Let us take the case of Tacitus. During the reign of Domitian, he did not wish to publish anything. When he broke a silence of fifteen years with two monographs, the *Life and Deeds of Julius Agricola* and the *Germania*, he hoisted the colors of the imitation of Sallust (so to speak) and sought to keep Cicero at arm’s length. But in the *Historiae*, covering the year of the three emperors and the “Flavian” years, and in the first half of the *Annales*, covering the history of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, he constructs a style all of his own, based on brevity and on the variation of syntactic means. It is only at the end of his writing career, i.e. in the second half of the *Annales*, that he arrives at a somewhat less mannered style.¹³ Within this *imitatio* of earlier literature, however, a number of shifts soon occurred. Now, it was no longer Cicero and Sallust, whom Tacitus had imitated for a time, who counted as the great models, but the archaic authors who wrote before the classical age. The period of archaism now begins and is dominant, or at least flourishing, for nearly a century, roughly from 120 to shortly after 200.

The archaists read the *Annales* of Ennius rather than the *Aeneid* of Vergil, and very explicitly give Cato the Elder and Gaius Gracchus a higher rank as orators than Cicero; they prefer an annalist like Claudius Quadrigarius to Livy. They have a particular preference for the ancient comedy, which had never disappeared from the stage in Rome: Plautus, Terence, and Caecilius Statius do not *become* popular, but rather *remain* popular, to the chagrin of those like Horace who wish for a fundamental renewal of Roman literature precisely in drama too.¹⁴ This archaism, which also found expression in the visual arts (though in a succession of waves, rather than continuously), now received a powerful encouragement and support from the generally rather extravagant taste of the Emperor Hadrian (117–138) and (in a less brash form) of his successor, Antoninus Pius (138–161), who appointed the most hard-line representative of archaism, the rhetor M. Cornelius Fronto (ca. 100 – ca. 160 CE), to the post of tutor of his sons.

¹³ On this, cf. especially N. Eriksson, *Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus*, dissertation, Lund 1934.

¹⁴ Here, we recall above all the passage in the first letter of Horace on literature (*Ep.* 2.1.224 ff.) in which he exhorts Augustus to devote more attention to the more modern Roman literature.

In addition to the endeavor to emulate a Caecilius Statius, an Ennius, or a Cato the Elder—where the choice of words plays a role that we tend to find exaggerated—this archaism is characterized by the continuous collection and quotation of the pre-classical literature. This second aspect can be seen above all in the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius (ca. 130 – ca. 190 CE), who had collected and systematically noted everything in his extensive reading that seemed to him worthwhile. He worked on this vast material during long winter evenings in Athens (hence the title of his work), quoting many texts from the pre-classical Roman literature of which almost nothing survives completely (with the exception of the comedies of Plautus and Terence and Cato's treatise *On Agriculture*). For example, it is thanks to him that we know the plot of the comedy *Plocium* ("The Necklace") of Caecilius Statius, which was very famous at that time; Volcacius Sedigitus gives the first place in his canon of Roman comedy to Statius rather than to Plautus. In Gellius, therefore, we find a praiseworthy endeavor to present precisely the best of the archaic literature.

By far the most versatile and gifted linguistic artist of this period, who drew only a part of his linguistic material from archaism, is the North African Apuleius of Madaura (born ca. 125 CE), who was revered in later centuries, even by Augustine,¹⁵ as the founder of the "African" literature. I have already observed that there was a strong feeling of common cultural, and especially literary bonds in the three provinces of the Atlas region.¹⁶ Of his writings, most of which survive, the novel *The Golden Ass* (or *Metamorphoses*) remains by far the most celebrated. He also wrote a short manual of Platonic philosophy (*De Platone et eius dogmate*) and a brief monograph on the *daimon* of Socrates, which he, like Tertullian, regarded as a demon (*De deo Socratis*), a collection of twenty-three rhetorical bravura pieces (the *Florida*), and a learned and elegant defense against the accusation that he had employed magic practices to get the wealthy widow Pudentilla to marry him (the *Apologia*).

Tertullian is strongly influenced by Apuleius both in his style and in his vocabulary. Let me mention only one concrete instance: his description of the sudden capsizing of a ship for no discernible reason (in ch. 52 of the treatise *On the Soul*) is clearly an imitation of one of the most celebrated *Florida* of Apuleius (nr. 23). He has certainly also taken over

¹⁵ On this, cf. Schanz-Hosius III, 4th edn. 1922 (1959), 134–135.

¹⁶ See above, p. xiv.

some of the information about magic in the *Apologia* of Apuleius,¹⁷ and probably used Apuleius' book about Plato in addition to the similar manual by Albinus, a representative of Middle Platonism in the mid-second century CE.

In order to understand this influence of Apuleius on the North African Christian literature of the imperial period, we need a clear idea of his style; and this is particularly useful, because Tertullian's writings are often very similar. In Apuleius, the archaism which had been the principal element of "poeticism" since the beginning of Roman literature, the reworking of the *Odyssey* by Livius Andronicus,¹⁸ is only one potential enrichment of his language. We find numerous neologisms in Apuleius (these had been strictly limited in classical Latin, especially by Horace); we find many colloquial expressions (from the great period of Cicero's writings onwards, these had been scorned as unworthy of the literary style); and there are many words or figures of speech from the poetic vocabulary (according to the rules of the classical period, there was no place for these in a prose text). The boundaries between these various forms of language and styles often run somewhat differently to what we would expect today. Frequently, a word that belonged to the pre-classical language but then disappeared from the classical literary language turns up anew in Apuleius (or in Tertullian or Arnobius). In such a case, there are always two possibilities, and it is not always easy to decide with certainty whether (a) the later (mostly North African) writers have taken over such a word from their reading of Plautus, Ennius, Cato, etc. and integrated it as an "archaism" into their own prose as a *pièce de résistance*, or (b) the word in question came from colloquial Latin (to which the comedies of Plautus and Terence are particularly close) and lived on during the *aetas aurea* (though banished from literature) until Apuleius and others took it over from colloquial language into their works. In view of the scantiness of the tradition, we can decide this question only when a word of this kind is attested by inscriptions in the classical period, for then we are certain that it lived on in the spoken language and was not adopted in the literary language merely as a reminiscence. Naturally, the meaning of the word is very helpful in making this decision: in general, a term from agriculture will always have been in use, even if it is not found in the literary idiom, which

¹⁷ Cf. Tertullian, *An.* 57, and my commentary *ad loc.*

¹⁸ On this, see my lecture "De komst der Muzen in Rome," Leidse voordrachten, 1956.

was obliged to avoid “words of a lowly level” (ταπεινά).¹⁹ On the other hand, a verb which was frequently employed in the archaic period, e.g. *autumare* or *perhibere*, both of which mean “to speak,” could be given a new lease of life by Apuleius as an “ornament of his language.”²⁰ There are many hundreds of such “archaisms” or “colloquialisms” in Apuleius and Tertullian. In the case of poetical expressions, we must bear in mind that rhetoric with its stylistic fireworks and metaphors had already entered the poetry of Rome. This happened to a modest extent with Ovid, but in a massive way in Lucan and Statius. Often, it is impossible to say with certainty whether a striking word belongs to the poetic language or to the idiom of rhetoric.

In Tertullian (though not in the contemporary pagan authors), the neologisms, which probably include the changes in the meanings of words, pose a problem, since we find a strikingly large number of words which occur for the first time (or the only time) in his writings, as well as a number of words which are *hapax legomena* in Latin literature as a whole. Heinrich Hoppe, who has made a very exact compilation of all the relevant material,²¹ uses the abbreviation “Tp” for the first group, and “T” for the second. Because of the sheer number of words which occur for the first or the only time in Tertullian, and the numerous changes in meanings (e.g. *census* = *origo*), he was celebrated until the beginning of the 1930’s as “the creator of Christian Latin.” It is the abiding merit of the Nijmegen school of Latinists, which was founded by Joseph Schrijnen and developed by Christine Mohrmann after his death to become an important center of research,²² that it has brought to light the great importance of the general idiom of the Christians who spoke and wrote

¹⁹ On this, see especially E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI*, 3rd edn. 1926, 115–116. The best example of the avoidance of the *sermo humilis* in elevated prose is the way in which Tacitus speaks of the dung cart in which Messalina attempted in vain to flee: *vehiculo, quo purgamenta hortorum eripiuntur* (Ann. 11.33.6).

²⁰ Cf. the description of the “beautiful” archaisms in Horace’s second letter about literature (Ep. 2.2.115–118): the poet who truly deserves this name *obscurata diu populo bonus eruet atque/proferet in lucem speciosa vocabula rerum, / quae priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis / nunc situs informis premit et deserta vetustas*.

²¹ H. Hoppe, *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians*, 1932, 133–148.

²² The Nijmegen school begins with the monograph by J. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*, *Latinitas Christianorum primaeva* (LCP) 1, 1933, and with Christine Mohrmann’s *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustinus* (LCP 3), 1933, and her *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, 4 vols., 1958–1977. The series LCP which she directs has published twenty-one volumes up to the time of writing, and the parallel series *Graecitas Christianorum primaeva* has published five volumes.

Latin.²³ To take only one example, it was once customary to regard the use of the noun *lavacrum* in the sense of “baptismal font” (and occasionally also of “baptism”) as an extension of meaning undertaken by Tertullian personally, since *lavacrum* with one of these two meanings is found for the first time in his writings. Here, however, the ever more intensive study of the Christian inscriptions has clarified the situation, and it may be regarded as certain that *lavacrum* was used in this sense by the Christians in the western regions of the empire even before Tertullian. On the other hand, Hoppe’s “Tp” words certainly include many that are truly to be attributed to Tertullian. Unfortunately, there has as yet been no systematic investigation of these “Tp” words, although the continuous publication and analysis of the material of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* makes this ever more practicable. But it is not only the vocabulary—which is of course extremely important for the language of Latin literature and poetry²⁴—but also the entire stylistic form which makes Tertullian’s prose style unique. He can express himself in lengthy sentences—as Apuleius does almost uninterruptedly, at least in *The Golden Ass*—constructed of one, two, or three clauses which often increase in length, supported by alliteration or assonance and occasionally also by end rhymes, in a refined metrical form which permeates the entire text.²⁵ The most extreme example of such a total rhetorical-metrical structuring is the brief *De pallio*, which gives the impression of being a “poem in prose” (and that is how Saeftlund presents it in his edition).²⁶ As an example of this style, we quote a passage from ch. 30.3 of the treatise *On the Soul*, where Tertullian writes that human beings have become ever more numerous on the earth:

*Certe quidem orbis in promptu est,
cultior de die et instructor pristino.
Omnia iam pervia, omnia nota, omnia negotiosa.
Solitudines famosas retro fundi amoenissimi oblitteraverunt,
silvas arva domuerunt, feras pecora fugaverunt.
Harenae seruntur, saxa panguntur, paludes eliquantur.
Tantae urbes quantae non casae quondam.
Iam nec insulae horrent nec scopuli terrent.
Ubique domus, ubique populus, ubique respublica, ubique vita.*

²³ In this context, I prefer to use the term “idiom” rather than *Sondersprache*, the term employed by the Nijmegen school.

²⁴ This is because the individual word has a much greater autonomy in Latin than in Greek, as can be seen especially in the old Latin Saturnian verse.

²⁵ For an analysis of the clauses in the treatise *De anima*, see my essay “The Technique of the Clausula in Tertullian’s *De anima*,” *Vig. Chr.* 4 (1950) 212–245.

²⁶ G. Saeftlund, *De Pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians*, Lund 1955.

In addition to this artistic structuring of the text, we find the staccato of extremely brief principal clauses, which Tertullian employs especially for a “presentation” (*narratio*), e.g. in his description of the fall of Her-motimus (*On the Soul* 44):

Ceterum de Hermotimo. Anima, ut aiunt, in somno carebat ... Uxor hoc prodidit. Inimici dormientem nacti pro defuncto cremaverunt. Regressa anima tardius, credo, homicidium sibi imputavit. Cives Clazomenii Herotimum templo consolantur. Mulier non adit ob notam uxoris.

Here, we have two instances where the form is completely dominant, and where it can dominate because the content has no great importance. But the total effect is extremely impressive when the content is predominant and the form is cultivated and adapted to this content, as can be seen in a consistently well considered and very exact choice of words. We can distinguish two principal forms here, the paratactic and the hypotactic. The best example of the first group is the list of the activities of the pagan philosophers in *De anima* 2.2. As an example of the second group, let me quote the first sentence of the same treatise:

De solo censu animae congressus Hermogeni, quatenus et istum ex materiae potius suggestu quam ex dei flatu constitisse praesumpsit, nunc ad reliquas conversus quaestiones plurimum videbor cum philosophis dimicaturus.

A surprising amount is said here in a sentence which is not excessively complicated (a participial clause from which a causal clause depends; then a second participial clause which—as the *nunc* shows—refers to a somewhat later stage, and then the principal clause), and the reader of these words is at once “in the picture.” The logical principal verb is of course the participle *conversus*: “I now turn to the other questions, and I shall be seen to engage in many disputes with the philosophers.” This sentence consists almost entirely of “words charged with meaning.” As we see also e.g. in the late odes of Horace and in Sallust and Tacitus,²⁷ the number of purely functional words is kept to a minimum.

The best proof that Tertullian’s idiom and style are something unusual and completely individual within Latin literature is the fact that no later Latin apologist or church father adopted this style. Minucius Felix’s style is very strongly influenced by Cicero, whose treatise *De natura deorum*, especially the second Book, is the main source for his *Apology* (though

²⁷ The almost complete loss of Sallust’s main work, the *Historiae*, means that his enormous importance for late Roman literature is constantly overlooked. This importance, which was certainly greater than that of the historical works of Livy and also of Tacitus, can be traced from Horace (*Epode* 16) to Augustine (especially in *The City of God*).

alongside Tertullian's *Apologeticum*); and Lactantius made the *concinnitas* of Cicero so much his own that Pico della Mirandola called him "the Christian Cicero." Many of Ambrose's writings are oriented to Cicero. Jerome does indeed take over many terms and *flosculi* from Tertullian's writings, but he never imitates his style in any profound manner. Finally, we must mention Augustine. He took a completely different path: in his "official" treatises, he writes what one could call an African (or indeed "Apuleian") form of the classical prose style, while he employs the colloquial language in his sermons—something that Tertullian never did, despite all the affirmations to the contrary by nineteenth-century Latinists. Thus Tertullian remained one of the greatest prose writers of Latin literature—but also the most strongly isolated.²⁸

²⁸ [English translation: Brian McNeil.]

TO MY WIFE

CONTENTS

Preface	IX
Introduction	1*
Text	1
Commentary	81
Bibliography	595
Indices	621
I. Index of proper names occurring in <i>De anima</i>	623
II. Index of quotations from Holy Scripture occurring in <i>De anima</i>	627
III. General Index	629
IV. Index of Grammar and of Latin words.	638
V. Editions of Tertullian's works referred to in the com- mentary	651

PREFACE

In 1933 I published as a dissertation an edition of Tertullian's *De anima* with an introduction, translation and commentary in German¹. In the course of my later studies it appeared to me that this difficult treatise required a more penetrating elucidation than I had given it: Tertullian's entirely personal way of reasoning, which sometimes results in over-subtlety, and the arbitrary manner in which he handles his material need to be constantly realized if one is to attain to a correct understanding of the *De anima*. It also became increasingly plain to me that a clearer picture could be given of Tertullian's authorities, especially of Soranus.

In view of these considerations I have prepared the present edition. The text contains only a few alterations; the introduction and the commentary, on the other hand, constitute an entirely new piece of work. The chapter-headings in the introduction speak for themselves. In the commentary I have aimed at presenting the reader immediately with the main lines of Tertullian's argument by a paraphrase of the contents of each chapter². It is my firm conviction that, as with Aristotle's works, such paraphrases serve the purpose of a correct understanding better than literal translations do, for what is difficult in Tertullian is his train of thought rather than his idiom. Nevertheless, particularly difficult passages have also been translated literally in the commentary.

I have endeavoured to provide what I consider necessary for an exact understanding of the treatise. A certain circumstantiality was unavoidable: it is impossible to expound Tertullian's observations on the migration of souls, on dreams, on eschatology, unless it is made clear at the same time what ideas he was combating, what he thought acceptable, and what made him take the stand he took. The linguistic explanation, too, sometimes demanded a similar minuteness, especially concerning late Latin phenomena which have as yet had little light thrown on them. For reasons of space I have reserved for another occasion my inquiry into the use of the 'clausulae'³.

¹) *Tertullian De Anima, mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1933; out of print). Further, *Index Verborum et Locutionum quae Tertulliani De Anima Libro continentur* (P. Hanstein, Bonn, 1935).

²) Each chapter of *De anima* can be regarded as an independent whole.

³) The results of this inquiry will be published as soon as possible in the review *Vigiliae Christianae*. Moreover, some additions to the commentary on chapters 39, 44 and 46 may be found in the articles "Traces of Aristotle's lost dialogues in Tertullian", which will appear in the same review, and "Fata Scribunda", which is to be published in the *Mnemosyne*.

Though the utmost care has been expended on the English text — I record with gratitude the very great assistance of Dra. W. Denijs (Utrecht), who corrected the commentary, and of Dra. E. Nijst (Nijmegen), who has done the same for the introduction — I am well aware that a foreigner who publishes anything in English will always betray himself, and I therefore ask for the indulgence of my British and American readers.

I desire to acknowledge with gratitude the help of my friend Professor W. J. Verdenius (Utrecht), who read through a considerable part of the commentary and with whom I discussed many of the most difficult passages, and of Dr. J. W. Ph. Borleffs (The Hague), who on several occasions gave me his expert advice on matters of textual criticism. I also wish to express my thanks to the University Libraries at Leiden and Utrecht, and, not least, to the publisher J. M. Meulenhoff of Amsterdam and the printer J. J. Groen of Leiden, who have spared no pains to carry out in such difficult times such a difficult piece of work.

LEIDEN, *March* 1947.

J. H. W.

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT; EDITIONS, TRANSLATIONS, AND COMMENTARIES

From the beginning of the Middle Ages four different collections of works of Tert. must have existed¹, viz. the collections found in the *Codex Agobardinus*, the *Codex Trecensis*, the so-called *Codices Cluniacenses* and *Hirsaugienses*², and the now lost manuscripts used by Gagneius, Gelenius, and Pamelius in their editions. Of these the first and part of the last (the manuscripts used by Gagneius and Gelenius) contained *De anima*.

A The chief authority for the text of *De anima* are pages 118v—166r of the *Codex Agobardinus*³ (*Parisinus Latinus* 1622), a parchment MS of the ninth century. A detailed description may be omitted here, as this has been given by Max. Klusmann⁴. The text of *De anima* begins at the last line but one of page 118v (6, 7: *de minutiloquio Aristotelis*), immediately following *idol.* 18 (R.W. 53, 7; the last word is *evitandum*); from this it follows that the latter part of *De idololatria* and the beginning of *De anima* must already have been missing in the manuscript copied by the transcriber of the *Agobardinus*. Moreover, two leaves (139r/140v), containing 26, 3 (the last word is *opinor*) — 28, 3 (the first words are *qui molliora*), have got lost after the pages had been numbered. I collated the relevant pages of this manuscript in October 1932, and for the present edition I have also made use of a photographic reproduction.

Concerning the value of this manuscript there is now more or less general agreement. Its chief defects are the many lacunae and numerous cases of haplography; for the rest, it may be qualified as generally

¹) Cf. especially Kroymann's prefaces to C.S.E.L. XLVII and LXX, and his papers: *Kritische Vorarbeiten für den III. und IV. Band der neuen Tertullian-Ausgabe* (Sitz. Ber. Akad. Wien 143, 1901); *Die Tertullian-Überlieferung in Italien* (ib. 138, 1898).

²) For a survey, see Kroymann, C.S.E.L. LXX, XXXVI.

³) In the works of Agobardus of Lyons (Migne P. L. 104, 29/350; edition of the letters by Dümmler, Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist., 5, 153/237) I found no traces of his having read *De anima*.

⁴) *Curarum Tertullianearum particulae tres* (Gotha 1887); cf. also Reifferscheid, C.S.E.L. XX, VI/IX; Borleffs, edition of *Ad nationes*, V/IX.

reliable¹, though the discovery of the *Codex Trecensis* has shown that its value had previously been somewhat overrated².

B Second in value is the edition of Martinus MESNARTIUS (Paris 1545), which was falsely ascribed to Ioannes Gagneius³. Mesnartius used a now lost manuscript which, as is shown by the text of *De baptismo*, was inferior to the *Codex Trecensis*⁴; the same may be said about its relation to the *Agobardinus*. In the margin (*Bmg*) Mesnartius gives divergent readings, the majority of which (62 out of 120 instances in *De anima*) were taken from the *Agobardinus*. The only copy known to me of this extremely rare work (it is not in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*) is kept in the library of Breslau University. In the interests of future editors of Tertullian I wish to point out that the readings of B given in Reifferscheid's *adnotatio critica* both in *De anima* and in *De idololatria* contain several mistakes, so that for other works of Tert. his data should only be used after careful checking.

Gel The edition of Sigismundus GELENIUS (Basel 1550) is based on the *Mesnartiana*; in addition to this, he made use of a *Codex Masburensis*⁵ for the text of twelve treatises⁶, of which *De anima* is one. Regarding the value of this manuscript it is impossible to make a definite statement, because Gelenius never indicates whether his divergencies from the text of Mesnartius are due to this manuscript or to conjectures of his own. According to Kroymann⁷, the latter possibility is much more probable; however, Borleffs' investigation of the authorities for the text of *De baptismo*⁸ has shown that these divergencies are in some places identical with the readings of the *Codex Trecensis*; from this Borleffs concludes that either the latter manuscript may have been copied from the *Masburensis* or both were derived from the same archetype. Though this conclusion is not of primary importance for the history of the text of *De anima*, it is yet adequate to show that Kroymann's scepticism was not quite justified. For the rest, it is not possible to say anything definite about this manuscript, except that in some way it must have been

¹) This was shown especially by the works of Löfstedt and Thörnell.

²) Kroymann, C.S.E.L. LXX, VIII *seqq.* (this fact is evident from the text of *De carne Christi*, which monograph is found in both manuscripts). I cannot subscribe to Kroymann's view (*ib.*, XI *seqq.*) that the *Agobardinus* contains interpolations.

³) For this question, see Kroymann, C.S.E.L. XLVII, XII; Gerlo, edition of *De pallio*, I, 11.

⁴) Kroymann, C.S.E.L. LXX, XXI; cf., however, Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 59 (1931), 5 *seqq.*

⁵) Kroymann, C.S.E.L. XLVII, XIII *seqq.*; *ib.* LXX, XXIV *seqq.*; Borleffs, *op. cit.*, 9.

⁶) For a list of these treatises, see Reifferscheid, C.S.E.L. XX, XI.

⁷) C.S.E.L. XLVII, XIII and XXIII; *Quaest. Tert. crit.* (Oeniponte 1893), 8; C.S.E.L. LXX, XXV.

⁸) *op. cit.*, 9/10.

related to the codex used by Mesnartius, both manuscripts containing the same works of Tert¹.

At all events, the *Geleniana* is of great importance for the text of *De anima*; according to Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 12), it corrects the text in no less than 89 places².

No other manuscripts containing *De anima* being known, the remaining editions only contribute conjectures regarding the constitution of the text.

The edition by Iacobus PAMELIUS³ (Antwerp 1579) is entirely based on the *Geleniana*. It contains a small number of (mostly erroneous) conjectures, to which must be added a few emendations by Paulus LEOPARDUS and HARRISIUS mentioned in the *Adnotationes*. Franciscus IUNIUS (Franeker 1597) gave no more than a reprint of the *Pameliana*. This edition is of importance for the *Adnotationes*, which on the whole contain many excellent emendations; however, with regard to *De anima* Iunius was less successful than usually⁴.

The edition by Ludovicus LA CERDA (Paris 1624—1630), which as a rule is not even mentioned, is also based on the *Pameliana*; the few conjectures concerning *De anima* are altogether wrong.

Nicolaus RIGALTIIUS based his edition (Paris 1634) on a collation of the *Agobardinus* which I have found to be more reliable than is usually granted; at all events, it is to be preferred to the collations used by Oehler. Most of his own conjectures with regard to the present treatise are wrong⁵, although on the whole he is certainly better than Pamelius and Iunius. The emendations by Ph. PRIORIUS, which are found in the notes added to the second and later editions of the *Rigaltiana*, are of some value too.

We may pass over the editions by J. S. SEMLER (Halle 1771), E. F. LEOPOLD (Leipsic 1841), and MIGNE (*Patrol. Lat.*, vol. 2), which are reprints of the *Rigaltiana*⁶.

The faults of OEHLER's edition (Leipsic 1854) have been clearly exposed by Kroymann⁷; its chief defect is the inaccurate *adnotatio critica*. Yet it should be remembered that Oehler possessed an un-

¹) For this question, see Kroymann, *Quaest. Tert. crit.*, 7/9. The possibility of the *Masburensis* being identical with the manuscript used by Mesnartius was first suggested by Reifferscheid (C.S.E.L. XX, XI); this suggestion was adopted by Kroymann (C.S.E.L. XLVII, XIII), who, however, finally assumed that the two manuscripts were closely related to each other (C.S.E.L. LXX, XXV).

²) In the present edition the number of readings adopted from Gelenius is smaller.

³) The *Codex Ioannis Clementis Angli* and the three *Codices Vaticani* used by Pamelius did not contain *De anima*.

⁴) Hoppe (*op. cit.*, 12) accepts only three of the emendations by Iunius.

⁵) Twenty-two of them are regarded as correct by Hoppe, *loc. cit.*

⁶) Semler's edition contains one conjecture by himself, viz. *producto* 48,1 (*producto* A B Gel); Migne's edition is a reprint of the third edition of the *Rigaltiana* with the notes by Priorius.

⁷) C.S.E.L. XLVII, XXVIII/XXXI.

questionable gift for textual criticism and interpretation; in several cases he found the right solution (cf. especially the note on 1, 3: *inviscatus palmas*).

REIFFERSCHIED (C.S.E.L. XX, Vienna 1890) was the first to give a reliable *adnotatio critica*¹, but his constitution of the text contains a great number of erroneous and even absurd conjectures. The defects of his work have been pointed out so frequently in the last thirty years that it is quite unnecessary to say anything more about them.

The various collections of conjectures (for which see the *Index Siglorum*) do not require any further comment; for the difficult questions concerning Fulvius URSINUS, see Kroymann, C.S.E.L. XLVII, XXVII, and Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 59 (1931), 10/1.

Of existing TRANSLATIONS by far the best is H. Kellner's²; it is, however, out of date, being based on Ochler's text. F. A. von Besnard (Augsburg 1837/8) only gives a paraphrase, but in the few places where he takes the trouble to translate the text, his version is better than Kellner's. A good English translation was given by Thelwall and Holmes³; the French translation by M. de Genoude⁴ and the Dutch one by J. Meyboom⁵ are thoroughly unreliable.

The INTERPRETATION of the text was not much advanced by the editors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The extremely circumstantial notes by Pamelius mainly contain dogmatic discussions of subjects mentioned by Tert., Iunius confines himself (not without success) to the explanation of obscure expressions, and Rigaltius as a rule bases his elucidations on those of his two predecessors or combats their interpretation (the work of the last-mentioned edition was largely drawn upon by Ochler). On the other hand, La Cerda made serious attempts to write a commentary in the full sense of the word; he was the only one to take into account the structure of Tert.'s work and his reasoning. Unfortunately, his commentary contains, in addition to many sensible remarks, an even greater number than does Pamelius' edition of highly complicated theological discussions.

The scanty notes added to Lindner's edition of *De anima* (Leipsic 1861) refer almost without exception to his emendations of the text, which for the greater part are wrong.

¹) This, however, does not apply to the data concerning the *Mesnartiana*, cf. p. 2*.

²) Kempten 1871; second edition, Cologne 1882. The new edition of this translation by Esser (Kempten 1912) unfortunately does not contain *De anima*.

³) Edinburgh 1870; of course this translation too is based on Ochler's text.

⁴) *Oeuvres de Tertullien*, 2 (Paris 1852), 1/115.

⁵) Leyden 1930.

CHAPTER II

THE DATE OF *DE ANIMA*

Though the literature on the chronology of Tert.'s works is very extensive, the incontrovertible data concerning the date at which *De anima* was composed may be summed up in a few sentences¹.

As a certain *terminus post quem* the martyrdom of Perpetua (7 March 203), referred to in 55, 4, may be quoted. For the rest, we have only such data at our disposal as are furnished by references in Tert.'s works.

In *De anima* Tert. quotes the treatises *De censu animae* (1, 1; 3, 4; 6, 3; 11, 2; 21, 6²; 22, 1/2; 24, 2), *Adversus Marcionem* II (21, 6), *De paradiso* (55, 5), and perhaps *De fato* (20, 5; see the comm.). I abandon my former opinion³ that a reference to the seven books *De ecstasi*⁴ is contained in 47, 4: *Ea* (sc. somnia) *autem, quae neque a deo neque a daemonio neque ab anima videbuntur accidere, . . . ipsi proprie ecstasi et rationi eius separabuntur*. Tert. rather means to say that such dreams should be ascribed to the *ecstasis* which, as was argued in 45, 3, constitutes the essence of the dream.

De anima is only quoted in *De resurrectione carnis*, viz., in ch. 2 (28, 13/4), 17 (47, 22/3), and 45 (92, 5).

The most important quotation found in *De anima* is that of the second book of *Adversus Marcionem*. Since it is certain that the 'official' edition of the first three books was published in the year 207⁵, this may be taken as a *terminus post quem*. It is *a priori* possible that Tert. is referring to the earlier edition⁶; however, this is far from probable, because he qualifies that edition as an *opusculum prope-ratum* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 1 = 290, 7), and no references to it from works prior to the year 207 are known.

The date at which *De resurrectione carnis* was composed can not be defined exactly⁷, so that the fact that *De anima* is prior to this treatise is not of great importance for the point at issue; on the other hand, the close relations between *De anima* and *De pallio* certainly furnish an indication for ascertaining the date of *De*

¹) The most important facts may be found in Harnack, *Chronologie altchristl. Lit.*, 2, 285.

²) Nearly all scholars dealing with the chronology of Tert.'s works in this passage assume a reference to *Adversus Hermogenem*.

³) Cf. my thesis, p. 9; this view was repeatedly defended by Noeldechen.

⁴) Probably the title was *Περὶ ἑκστάσεως* (cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, 277).

⁵) *Adv. Marc.* 1, 15 (309, 15/6): *anno quinto decimo iam Severi imperatoris*, i. e., between 1 June 207 and 1 June 208. As to the various editions, cf. G. Quispel, *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, 1/21.

⁶) Cf. e. g. Harnack, *op. cit.*, 285. I follow Dr. Quispel in assuming that *Adv. Marc.* was not published three times, but twice.

⁷) This treatise is posterior to *De carne Christi* and *Adv. Marc.* IV, and prior to *Adv. Marc.* V (Harnack, *op. cit.*, 284). In ch. 22 (56, 11) the words *omni adhuc popularium coetu reclamante Christianos ad leonem* almost certainly refer to the persecution of Christians by Scapula, so that the year 211 is the *terminus post quem*. All other assertions concerning the date of *De resurrectione carnis* I regard as doubtful to the last degree.

*anima*¹. I cannot subscribe to Klein's opinion² that in *pall.* 5, 5/7 and *an.* 33, 4 the allusions to the luxuries of Apicius, Aufidius Lurco, and others are to be regarded as 'commonplace notes'³: Tert. purposely borrowed these data (and many others) from Pliny for his highly rhetorical and baroque treatise *De pallio*; when he was working on *De anima*, he still had these passages in mind. To this may be added a remarkable grammatical parallel. In *pall.* 4, 2 a very singular impersonal use of the verb *sonare* is found (*de proelio sonuerat*), which is in perfect accordance with the style of this pamphlet. The only other passage in Latin literature in which this construction occurs is *an.* 17, 3: *de plaustro credimus sonitum*. But the most important parallel is found in *pall.* 2, 6/7 ∞ *an.* 30, 2/3: in both passages Tert. gives an account of migrations, which he borrowed from Varro, and which is followed by a panegyric description of the peacefulness and prosperity of the world. This can only refer to the time of peace between the years 208 and 211⁴.

However, there are some signs which indicate that this time was drawing to an end when Tert. was composing *De anima*. Perhaps this may be deduced from a comparison between *an.* 30, 4 (*vix nobis elementa sufficiunt, et necessitates artiores, et querellae apud omnes, dum iam nos natura non sustinet*) and *pall.* 1, 1 (*pacis haec et annonae otia, ab imperio et a caelo bene est*), for in the short treatise *Ad Scapulam*, which was certainly written in the year 212, Tert. mentions some natural phenomena which may have caused a shortage of food⁵; it is, however, equally possible that in *an.* 30, 4 Tert. is only speaking in general. On the other hand, Tert.'s words in *an.* 55, 5 contain an unmistakable exhortation to martyrdom, which could only make sense, if at the time this kind of death was not impossible. Now we know that in 211 Scapula, proconsul of Africa, ordered a persecution of Christians which almost certainly did not end before the beginning of the year 213⁶. In this connection it is particularly important to note that in the passage just mentioned Tert. quotes an oracle by a Montanistic prophetess which is also found in *De fuga in persecutione* (9, 4), a treatise composed in 211 or 212. Since, moreover, the metaphor *clavis paradisi* also occurs in *Scorpiace*, a work written during the same persecution⁷, the conclusion may be drawn that *De anima* was composed shortly before or during the persecution of Scapula, i. e., between the years 210 and 213.

¹) Cf. my thesis, p. 9; this view was contested by Gerlo in his edition of *De pallio* (1, 45_a) and by Klein (Tert., 257/8); cf., however, Harnack, *op. cit.* 285.

²) *op. cit.*, 258.

³) 'kursierende Münze'.

⁴) Cf. e. g. Gerlo, *op. cit.*, 38/45; Axelson, *Min. Fel. u. Tert.*, 24₄₁. Yet Klein (*op. cit.*, 258) again upholds the view that *De pallio* was composed in the year 193.

⁵) The shortage mentioned in *Scap.* 3, which Noeldechen refers to in this connection, took place earlier *sub Hilariano praeside*.

⁶) According to Sulp. Sev. *chron.* 2, 32, 2, a thirty-eight years' peace preceded the persecution by Decius.

⁷) *Scorp.* 10 (167, 24); cf. Krüger in Schanz, *Röm. Lit. Gesch.*, 3³, 299.

CHAPTER III

TERT.'S REASONS FOR WRITING *DE ANIMA*.
THE TREATISE *DE CENSU ANIMAE*

The reasons which induced Tert. to devote a monograph to the soul have been clearly expressed by himself in the first sentence of ch. 1 and in the first two sentences of ch. 3. From the first passage we learn that, after contesting the view of Hermogenes about the origin and the original essence of the soul, Tert. wishes to discuss all further questions concerning the soul, which will needs lead him into a continuous controversy with pagan philosophy. After a detailed description of the methods adopted by philosophers, he says in 3, 1: "If only the necessity that there should be heresies did not exist! In that case we should not be compelled here again to combat the philosophers, who may be qualified as the patriarchs of the heretics". From this it is evident that the entire controversy with pagan philosophy is primarily subservient to the purpose of attacking the foundations of heresies; when analysing the ideas expressed in *De anima*, we should never lose sight of this fact. It is for this reason that the usual qualification of *De anima* as 'the first Christian psychology' is apt to call up false associations, for this work is not in the first place a scientific treatise but a refutation of heretical doctrines about the soul: together with *De carne Christi* and *De resurrectione mortuorum* it belongs to the same group as the treatises *Adversus Hermogenem*, *Adversus Marcionem*, and *Adversus Praxeum*.

To understand *De anima* fully we ought to have access to *De censu animae* <*adversus Hermogenem*>¹, not only because this work induced Tert. to occupy himself with psychological problems, but also because he continually assumes that the readers of *De anima* are acquainted with it. He refers to it no less than nine times, and frequently cuts short a discussion on highly important subjects because on these he had in the earlier treatise already said everything there was to say; thus, for instance, we do not know the grounds on which Tert. defended the immortality of the soul (cf. comm. on 22, 2).

Before we proceed to collect and interpret these references, we must first describe such parts of the doctrine of Hermogenes as are necessary to understand his psychology.

Hermogenes², who originally hailed from the eastern parts of the

¹) That *De censu animae* was a separate treatise (a fact questioned by some scholars), is evident from the words *suum titulum* (= *librum*) in 3, 4, which cannot possibly refer to *Adversus Hermogenem*, as the soul is not discussed in that monograph.

²) For further particulars, see G. Uhlhorn in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*³, 7, 756/8; Harnack, *Überlieferung und Bestand der altchristl. Lit.* (1893), 200 and *Chronol. altchr. Lit.* (1897), 1, 534 seqq.; Neander, *Antignostikus*³, 336/58; for the psychological views of Hermogenes, see Neander, *op. cit.*, 355/8; Hauck, *Tert.'s Leben und Schriften*, 259/60; Esser, 30/7. The identification of the Hermogenes opposed by Theophilus with Tert.'s opponent was wrongly questioned by Mosheim and Walch (cf. Uhlhorn, *loc. cit.*).

Roman empire, where Theophilus of Antioch had composed a special treatise against him¹, afterwards settled down in Carthage, where he was a painter by profession. He was still alive when Tert., probably in 205/6, wrote his treatise *Adversus Hermogenem*².

Hermogenes' doctrine was based on the thesis that matter is eternal, and that a *creatio ex nihilo* is impossible³. His argument ran as follows: "God created all things either from His own being, or from nothing, or again from some pre-existent matter. The first possibility is precluded, because God is immutable, the second, because in that case He would have created matter of His own free will. Evil can only have sprung *ex vitio alicuius rei*, more exactly from matter, from which all other things must likewise have been created. So in Gen. 1, 1 the words ἐν ἀρχῇ must refer to matter"⁴.

Probably influenced by the Platonic conception τὸ ἀπειρον, Hermogenes qualified matter as completely undefined. According to him, it is neither good nor evil (Tert. *op. cit.*, 37), for in the first case the influence exercised on it by God would have been of no avail, in the second God could not have influenced it. Similarly, it is neither corporeal nor incorporeal, so that both corporeal and incorporeal substances may be created from it⁵; with regard to this 'incorporeity' Hermogenes assumes an irregular motion of matter (Tert., *op. cit.*, 36 (165, 15/7): *corporale enim materiae vult esse, de quo corpora edantur, incorporale vero inconditum motum eius*), which he compares to the boiling of water in a kettle (Hippolyt. *refut.* 8, 17: δίκην χ[εύμα]τος ὑποκαιομένου βράζουσας, sc. ὕλην; Tert., *op. cit.*, 41 (170, 13); the latter author even mentions a *caccabacius motus*).

God influences matter by His appearance and His approach to it, just as beauty exerts an influence by its mere appearance, and a magnet by merely approaching an object⁶. The exertion of this influence is possible, because God and matter have something in common, viz., motion, which, however, in God is of a regular order, in matter of an irregular one⁷. This *inconditus motus* is regulated by the influence of God⁸, but never finally⁹, for the 'moulding' of matter by God is an 'eternal task' (cf. Tert., *op. cit.*, 38/9), which has neither a beginning nor a termination in time¹⁰, and never lets the δύναμις pass completely into the ἐνεργεία: as in the parts the

¹) Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 4, 24, 1; perhaps Tert. was acquainted with his work (Quispel, 52).

²) Adv. Herm. 1 (126, 8/9): *ad hodiernum homo in saeculo*.

³) Tert. *adv. Herm.* 1.

⁴) *ib.*, 2/3.

⁵) *ib.*, 36 (165, 12/3): *iam ergo ne neutrum sit, utrumque materia censenda est?* Here the influence of the Aristotelian conception δύναμις may be seen.

⁶) *ib.*, 44 (173, 17/20).

⁷) *ib.*, 42 (172, 16/8).

⁸) *ib.*, 43 (172, 24/173, 2).

⁹) *ib.*, 38 (168, 4/5).

¹⁰) The best exposition of this subject is still that in Neander, *op. cit.*, 346/7.

whole can be recognized¹, so in anything created the matter underlying it is still perceptible. Whatsoever in matter resists a complete regulation, is the cause of defectiveness and evil in the world.

Having thus created the conditions for an understanding of Ihermogenes' psychology, we may now proceed to collect what is known about the treatise *De Censu Animae*.

First we must mention nine passages from *De anima* in which this work is referred to.

- I. 1, 1 *De solo censu animae congressus Hermogeni, quatenus et istum ex materiae potius suggestu quam ex dei flatu constituisse praesumpsit, . . .*
- II. 3, 4 *Una iam congressione decisa adversus Hermogenen, ut praefati sumus, quia animam ex dei flatu, non ex materia vindicamus, muniti et illic divinae determinationis inobscurabili regula: 'et flavit', inquit, 'deus flatum vitae in faciem hominis, et factus est homo in animam vivam', utique ex dei flatu, de isto nihil amplius revolvendum; habet suum titulum (= librum, i. e. De Censu animae) et suum haereticum (viz. Hermogenes).*
- III. 11, 2 *Ceterum adversus Hermogenen, qui eam (sc. animam) ex materia, non ex dei flatu contendit, flatum proprie tuemur. Ille enim adversus ipsius scripturae fidem flatum in spiritum vertit, ut, dum incredibile est spiritum dei in delictum et mox in iudicium devenire, ex materia potius anima credatur quam ex dei spiritu. Idcirco nos et illic flatum eam defendimus, non spiritum, secundum scripturam et secundum spiritus distinctionem.*
- IV. 21, 6 *Inesse autem nobis τὸ ἀντεξούσιον naturaliter iam et Marcioni ostendimus et Hermogeni.*
- V. 22, 1 *Cetera animae naturalia iam a nobis audiit Hermogenes cum ipsorum defensione et probatione, per quae dei potius quam materiae propinqua cognoscitur. Hic solummodo nominabuntur, ne praeterita videantur. Dedimus enim illi et libertatem arbitrii, ut supra scripsimus, et dominationem rerum et divinationem interdum, seposita quae per dei gratiam obvenit ex prophetia . . . 2. Definimus animam dei flatu natam, immortalem, corporalem, effigiatam, substantia simplicem, de suo sapientem, varie procedentem, liberam arbitrii, accidentis obnoxiam, per ingenia mutabilem, rationalem, dominatricem, divinatricem, ex una redundantem (see for this passage the comm. on ch. 22; the subjects certainly discussed in *De Censu animae* — i. e. not discussed in *De anima* — are: libertas arbitrii-dominatio rerum-divinatio interdum-immortalitas).*
- VI. 24, 2 *Nos autem, qui nihil deo adpendimus, hoc ipso animam longe infra deum expendimus, quod natam eam agnoscimus ac per hoc dilutioris divinitatis et exilioris felicitatis, ut flatum, non ut spiritum; et si immortalem, ut hoc sit divinitatis, tamen passibilem, ut hoc sit nativitatis, ideoque et a primordio exorbitationis capacem et inde etiam oblivionis affinem. Satis de isto cum Hermogene.*
- VII. 24, 10 *Multa item documenta teste ipso Platone divinationem animae probaverunt, quae proposuimus iam Hermogeni.*

¹) Adv. Iherm. 30 (169, 14/5): partes autem eius omnia simul ex omnibus habent, ut ex partibus totum dinoscatur.

To these passages, which contain the name of Hermogenes, two more may be added:

VIII. 4 *Consequens enim est, ut ex dei flatu animam professi initium ei deputaremus.*

IX. 6, 3 *... ostendimus autem supra moveri animam et ab alio, cum vaticinatur, cum furit* (for these two places, see the comm. *ad loc.*).

Finally, we may mention two passages of very unequal value. X. The first includes the greater part of the ninth chapter of *adv. Marc.* 2. Marcion had remarked (or rather Tert. had made him remark) that, the soul being 'the breath of God' and having fallen into sin, the *substantia creatoris* must be capable of sinning. In refutation of this Tert. observes (345, 24/346, 4): *ad hoc interpretanda erit qualitas animae. inprimis tenendum quod Graeca scriptura signavit, adflatum nominans, non spiritum. quidam enim de Graeco interpretantes non recognitata differentia nec curata proprietate verborum pro adflatu spiritum ponunt et dant haereticis occasionem spiritum dei delicto infuscandi, id est ipsum deum. et usurpata iam quaestio est* (an evident reference to *De censu animae*). In what follows the difference between *flatus* and *spiritus* is discussed; the similarity of this discussion to the passages from *De anima* just quoted shows with perfect clearness that Tert. has drawn upon the treatise *De censu animae*. The passage is so important for the present investigation that it must be quoted in full¹; such expressions as have a parallel in *De anima* are spaced. Immediately after the above Tert. remarks: *intellege itaque adflatum minorem spiritu esse, ut aurulam eius, et si de spiritu accidit, non tamen spiritum. nam et aura vento rarior, et si de vento aura, non tamen ventus aura. capit etiam imaginem spiritus dicere flatum. nam et ideo homo imago dei, id est spiritus; deus enim spiritus. imago ergo spiritus flatus. porro imago veritati non usquequaque adaequabitur. aliud est enim secundum veritatem esse, aliud ipsam veritatem esse. sic et adflatus, cum imago sit spiritus, non potest ita imaginem dei comparare, ut, quia veritas, id est spiritus, id est deus, sine delicto est, ideo et imago, id est adflatus, <id est homo,> non debuerit admisisse delictum. in hoc erit imago minor veritate et adflatus spiritu inferior, habens illas utique lineas dei, qua immortalis, qua libera et sui arbitrii, qua praescia plerumque, qua rationalis, capax intellectus et scientiae, tamen et in his imago et non usque ad ipsam vim divinitatis; sic nec usque ad integritatem a delicto, quia hoc soli deo cedit id est veritati, et hoc solum imagini non licet. sicut enim imago, cum omnes lineas exprimat veritatis, vi tamen ipsa caret, non habens motum, ita et anima, imago spiritus, solam vim eius exprimere non valuit, id est non delinquendi felicitatem. ceterum non esset anima, sed spiritus, nec homo qui animam sortitus est, sed deus. et alias autem non omne quod dei erit, deus habebitur, ut expostules deum et adflatum, id est vacuum a delicto, quia dei sit adflatus* ('so that you might require that the breath, too, is God, i. e., free from sin, because it is the breath of God'). . . denique

¹) In one place (346, 7) I adopt Oehler's punctuation.

cum manifeste scriptura dicat flasse deum in faciem hominis et factum hominem in animam vivam, non in spiritum vivificantem, separavit eam a condicione factoris. opus enim aliud sit necesse est ab artifice, id est inferius artifice . . . ipsum quod ('on account of the very fact that') *anima vocitatus est flatus, vide, ne etiam de adflatus condicione transierit in aliquam diminutionem qualitatem* (346, 4/347, 10). Subsequently Tert. contests Marcion's doctrine concerning free will; from this discussion the following particulars should be noted: a) the definition of the soul as *dominum universitatis* (347, 13); b) the remarks on the Fall (347, 15/9): *hoc ipsum* (sc. in dei lege consistere nolle) *ergo potuit adflatus dei admittere; potuit, sed non debuit. potuisse enim habuit per substantiae exilitatem, qua adflatus, non spiritus, non debuisse autem per arbitrii potestatem, qua liber, non servus*; c) the definition of free will as *illud, quod substantiae accessit* (347, 23), which definition will raise an apparent difficulty.

- XI. To the allusions found in *De anima* and *Adversus Marcionem* two passages from other authors, attention to which was drawn by Harnack¹, may perhaps be added. The first is Filastr. *haeres.* 126, 1: *Est et alia haeresis quae de censu animae ambigens ex elementis eam consistere opinatur, ut multi philosophi vanissimi nunc de igne, nunc de aqua, nunc de spiritu, nunc de materia, nunc de fonte, nunc de atomis, nunc quasi aëra esse animam hominis suspicantur, cum anima facta sit a domino, ex nihilo scilicet, ut scriptum est: 'Qui fecit ex nihilo omnia, ut essent quae non erant'.* The supposition that the contents of this sentence are derived from the treatise *De censu animae* is supported by the fact that, apart from this passage, the expression *census animae* is only found in the works of Tert. and Jerome², and by the similarity of the enumeration of philosophical views occurring here to that in *De anima* 5, 2/3³. On the other hand it should be remembered (as was also pointed out by Harnack) that, according to Tert., the soul had not sprung *ex nihilo* but *ex flatu dei*⁴.

- XII. The other passage is found in the treatise *De origine animae* wrongly ascribed to Ambrose: *Cesset Ermogenis, qui dicit nihil post mortem hominem futurum* (Caspary, *Kirchenhistorische Anekdoten*, 229). Cf. also *ib.*: *cesset Plato qui dicit fontem esse animarum* (see the comm. on 20, 6).

The first conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that Her-

¹) Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1895, 567/8.

²) Jer. of course borrowed this expression from Tert.

³) *de igne, de aqua, de atomis*: 5, 2; *de spiritu*: 5, 3; for *de fonte*, cf. comm. on 20, 6, for *aëra*, on 9, 5.

⁴) I cannot subscribe to Harnack's opinion that the influence of *De censu animae* may also be perceived in Filastr. 55, in which chapter the heretical doctrines of the *Galatae*, Seleucus, and Hermias are described. Harnack has not succeeded in demonstrating that this Hermias is indeed identical with Hermogenes, who in ch. 54 is explicitly mentioned; moreover, the view on the origin of evil recorded in this chapter (*malum autem aliquando a deo, aliquando esse a materia asserunt*) plainly contradicts the theory of Hermogenes on the same subject (cf. p. 8*). Finally, the contents of frag. XII (cf. below) have nothing to do with the end of Filastr. 55, as is supposed by Harnack.

mogenes considered the original substance of the soul, the *census animae* (I), to have sprung from matter (I; II; III; V). He must have regarded this assertion as a natural consequence of the fact that, according to Gen. 2, 7 (a passage which played a prominent part in his theory), the soul was one of the created substances, to which this law applied without exception; yet he found a special motivation for it in the circumstance that the soul immediately after its creation fell into sin (III), and so could not possibly have sprung from God¹. Since, however, in Gen. 2, 7 a relation between God and the human soul was clearly stated (καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς), Hermogenes avoided the difficulty by a curious conjecture (X). On this point Tert. remarks (III): "Contrary to the truth (i. e., the true reading) of Holy Spirit, he changed 'breath' (πνοή) into 'spirit' (πνεῦμα), in order that (because it is inconceivable that the Spirit of God should fall into sin and hence be judged) the soul should rather be regarded as having sprung from matter than from the Spirit of God". Hence Hermogenes' reasoning may be reconstructed as follows: "It is certain that the soul has fallen into sin. Now Holy Scripture mentions an *afflatus dei* at the creation of man, whence it may be concluded that this *afflatus*, too, if it formed part of the soul, would have fallen into sin; if so, we should have to assume a relation between God and sin, which is a blasphemous supposition and so must be rejected. Hence it must be demonstrated that the substance breathed by God into Adam's face could not fall into sin; if we read πνοὴν ζωῆς, this is not at once evident, but if the text gives πνεῦμα ζωῆς², everybody will reject the possibility that this substance could have fallen into sin. This being established, we are obliged to conclude that this πνεῦμα ζωῆς did not belong to the nature of the sinful soul. So the nature of the soul did not spring from God, and hence must have originated from matter; the πνεῦμα ζωῆς, breathed by God into Adam's face, was no more than an *accidens* of the soul". It is evident from further statements by Tert. that Hermogenes regarded this accidental πνεῦμα ζωῆς as comprising all the higher faculties of the soul³, which are consequently *accidentia* as well, and so may get lost. It is in this way that we must explain frag. XII, which, as was rightly pointed out by Uhlhorn (*op. cit.*, 757), refers to the loss of immortality in consequence of sin⁴; this interpretation is supported by the fact that in 24, 2 Tert. upholds the immortality of the soul in opposition to Hermogenes.

It is evident that the refutation by Tert. must have consisted of

¹) A third possibility, viz., the creation of the soul from nothing, was not discussed by Hermogenes, because he rejected the *creatio ex nihilo* in general (Tert. *adv. Herm.* 2).

²) According to Hauck (*Tert.*, 259/60), Hermogenes did not read πνεῦμα ζωῆς, but πνεῦμα only, which he translated by 'wind'. This impossible supposition has already been refuted by Esser, 38₂; it is also refuted by the fact that Tert. writes (III): '*flatum*' in '*spiritum*' vertit (if Hauck were right, he would have written '*flatum vitae*' instead of '*flatum*').

³) For a list of these faculties, see below.

⁴) Perhaps we should rather say: in consequence of the Fall.

two parts. First he defended the traditional reading πνοήν ζωῆς in Gen. 2, 7, and demonstrated that the 'breath of God', on account of the very fact that it is "inferior to the *spiritus* and, though originating from God, is not <a part of> God himself", can be induced to sin of its own free will (X); so the fact that the *spiritus* cannot possibly fall into sin (a fact also admitted by Tert.¹) does not imply that the sinful soul has sprung from matter. In the second part Tert. discussed all the higher faculties of the soul, and upheld his chief point (viz., that it was no accidental *spiritus vitae* which God breathed into Adam's face) by demonstrating by means of further arguments² that all these faculties are inherent in the nature of the soul³.

In *an.* 22 Tert. gives a complete list of the faculties described in *De censu animae* and in *an.* 5/21, so that, by a process of elimination, we are able to state which *naturalia animae* were certainly dealt with in the former treatise; moreover, we have several direct references at our disposal. So the following list may be drawn up:

1) freedom of will (IV; V; X); 2) domination of the world (VI; X); 3) capability of prophesying (VI; VII; X); 4) immortality (V; VI); 5) possession of reason (V; X). In addition to this Tert. argued that the soul, having sprung from God, 6) has a beginning in time (VI; VIII), whence he concluded 7) its *passibilitas* (VI), which in its turn implied 8) its capability of sinning (VI). Frag. IX undoubtedly refers to the *divinatio*, more exactly, the prophecy originating from the grace of God.

From all this it is evident that the refutation of Hermogenes, in the first place of his alteration of the text in Gen. 2, 7, induced Tert., if not to define the soul as *flatus dei* (this definition evolving quite naturally from the scriptural passage just mentioned), at least to draw strict conclusions from his own thesis and to point out as clearly as possible the difference between *flatus* and *spiritus*. We should not, however, lose sight of the fact that a similar differentiation had already been made before Tert. Irenaeus (5, 12, 2) distinguishes between the πνοή, i. e., the soul, and the πνεῦμα, a substance not bestowed on everybody, which makes its possessor a πνευματικός (see the preface to ch. 11, where Tert. follows this passage). Since the influence of Irenaeus' work is to be found in several of the treatises prior to *De anima*, it may be assumed that in *De censu animae*, too, Tert. drew upon it.

¹) *Adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 12/3): *quia veritas, id est spiritus, id est deus, sine delicto est.*

²) This is proved by the fact that in his demonstration of the *divinatio animae* Tert. quoted Plato (cf. p. 304).

³) Hermogenes' argument may be summarized by two syllogisms, the conclusion of the first being a premiss of the second: "I. A. The soul may fall into sin. B. God breathed into Adam's face the πνεῦμα ζωῆς, which cannot fall into sin. C. So this πνεῦμα ζωῆς was not inherent in the soul, but an *accidens animae*. — II. A. The πνεῦμα ζωῆς was an *accidens animae*. B. The higher faculties of the soul form part of this πνεῦμα ζωῆς. C. So the higher faculties of the soul are *accidentia animae*". Tert. accepts I A and the second part of I B, and contests the first part of I B (and hence also II C).

Another remarkable parallel also calls for discussion. If we analyse the most detailed account available of the contents of *De censu animae* (X), we find two fundamental conceptions: the soul as *aura* (or *aurula*) *spiritus*, and as *imago spiritus*. For the first metaphor we find a parallel in Philo, who in *leg. alleg.* 1, 42 writes: 'Πνοήν' δέ, ἀλλ' οὐ πνεῦμα, εἴρηκεν, ὡς διαφορᾶς οὔσης· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πνεῦμα νενόηται κατὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ εὐτονίαν καὶ δύναμιν, ἥ δ' ἐπνοή ὡς ἂν αὔρα τίς ἐστι καὶ ἀναδυμίσις ἡρεμμία καὶ πραεΐα. Ὁ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα γεγονώς καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν νοῦς πνεύματος ἂν λέγοιτο κεκοινωνηκέναι — ῥώμην γὰρ ἔχει ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτοῦ —, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τῆς κοῦφης καὶ ἐλαφροτέρας αὔρας ὡς ἂν ἀποφορᾶς τινος, ὅποῖαι γίνονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρωμάτων. The possibility¹ must be taken into account that Tert. had somehow become acquainted with Philo's theory; however, three facts must not be lost sight of. First, the comparison of the soul to an *aur(ul)a*, though occurring nowhere else in Tert.'s works, was fairly obvious in this connection. Secondly, the differentiation does not play a prominent part in Philo's works, as is shown by the fact that he frequently writes πνεῦμα where we should expect πνοή (in a paraphrase: *de opif. mundi* 135; in a quotation: *leg. alleg.* 3, 161; *quod deter. pot. insid.* 80; cf. Leisegang, *Der heilige Geist*, 1, 81₃; see also *de virtut.* 203). Thirdly, Philo compares the πνοή to an αὔρα without a genitive adjunct, whereas Tert. mentions an *aura spiritus*. If, in spite of these facts, Tert. was indeed influenced by Philo's theory, we are not able to say how he became acquainted with it. To my knowledge, there are no signs indicating that Tert. read Philo himself; the most plausible supposition is that Greek exegetes of Holy Scripture acted as intermediaries².

So we may conclude that Tert.'s definition of the soul as *flatus factus ex spiritu, minor tamen spiritu* is primarily due to his controversy with Hermogenes, but that we must also take into account the influence of Irenaeus and perhaps of Philo.

¹) G. Quispel (*De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, 139₃), after quoting *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 4) and *leg. alleg.* 1, 13, explicitly states Tert.'s dependence on Philo, but reserves further judgment. For πνοή, cf. also Athenagoras *legatio* 7. For other passages in which the influence of Philo may be assumed, see the comm. on 43, 12 and the preface to ch. 45.

²) The influence of this exegesis may perhaps be found in ch. 26 and 37 (see comm., pp. 335/6 and 426); for another curious parallel from Philo see the note on 43, 12 (p. 474).

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

A. Preface (1/3): the necessity to contest the views of pagan philosophers about the soul.

a. The discussion by Socrates, the *princeps philosophorum*, on the soul, as recorded in Plato's *Phaedo*, was of no value (1).

b. Though it is true that the statements of pagan philosophers frequently contain a partial truth, they connect true assertions with false arguments, and *vice versa*; hence it is necessary to detach the discussion of this subject from pagan philosophy, and to base it on divine revelation; in doing so, we also put an end to useless investigations forbidden by Holy Scripture (2).

c. Pagan philosophers are especially dangerous, because they are the 'patriarchs of the heretics'; hence they lead astray not only pagans but also Christians (3).

B. First part (4/22): the most important qualities of the soul.

I. Its beginning (4)

Having sprung from the breath of God, as was discussed in *De censu animae*, the soul has a beginning in time. Refutation of the contrary view of Plato.

II. Corporeality (5/8).

a. General (5/7).

1. Enumeration of the arguments of the Stoics in favour of the corporeality of the soul (5).

2. Refutation of the arguments of the Platonists in favour of the incorporeity of the soul (6).

3. An argument from Holy Scripture: the story (not parable!) of Lazarus (7).

b. Special (8).

The soul is not more different from other bodies than these bodies differ from one another (8, 1/2).

Refutation of a special argument (the apparent increase in weight of dead bodies) (8, 3).

The invisibility of the soul, a quality not shared by other bodies, has no unlimited validity (8, 4/5).

III. Shape and colour (9).

The shape of the soul is similar to that of the body.

a. General considerations (9, 1/2).

b. Demonstration based on a vision granted to an adherent of the Montanists (9, 3/4). Digression on the colour of the soul (9, 5/6).

c. Demonstration based on Gen. 2, 7 and other scriptural passages (9, 7/8).

IV. U n i t y (10/14).

a. *Anima* and *spiritus* (10/1).

The soul is not different from the life-breath. Refutation of the opposite view based on the assertion that insects have no lungs and windpipes, and so cannot breathe (10, 1/7a). Other arguments in favour of the identity of the soul and the life-breath (10, 7b/9).

However, the soul is not the same substance as the *spiritus*, as was asserted by Hermogenes; every 'spirit' which is added to the soul is no more than an *accidens animae* (11).

b. *Anima* and *animus* (12/3).

The mind, the importance of which is overrated by the Valentinians, by Anaxagoras, and by Aristotle, is no more than a function (*officium*) of the soul (12). Demonstration of this assertion from everyday speech and from Holy Scripture (13).

c. *The parts of the soul* (14).

Subdivisions of the soul assumed by philosophers (14, 1/2). It is better to speak of 'powers' of the soul (14, 3). Comparison to a hydraulic organ (14, 4). The more correct views of Strato, Aenesidemus, and Heraclitus (14, 5).

V. Q u e s t i o n s c o n c e r n i n g t h e u n i t y o f t h e s o u l (15/21).

a. *The ἡγεμονικόν* (15).

The soul possesses a central organ seated in the heart (15, 1/2); this view is held by numerous philosophers; evidence of it is also found in Holy Scripture (15, 3/6).

b. *The ἄλογον* (16).

The *inrationalis* is not inherent in the original nature of the soul; it has originated from the devil (16, 1/3). However, there are also a rational wrath and rational desires, as is shown by Holy Scripture (16, 4/7).

c. *Sense-perception* (17).

The senses are completely reliable. So-called illusions of the senses always have a special cause accurately transmitted by them (17, 1/10). Whoever rejects the reliability of the senses makes human life impossible (17, 11). Plato's inconsistency (17, 12). Proofs from Holy Scripture (17, 13/4).

d. *Acquiring of knowledge through the mind* (18).

We should not follow Plato and the Valentinians in putting the mind on a higher level than the senses, for by so doing we separate it from the senses and thereby destroy the unity of the soul.

e. *The soul is complete from its very beginning* (19).

Refutation of the view that children are incapable of thinking, and are on a level with plants, as was stated by Aristotle: even young plants can think, so that *a fortiori* the same holds good of children (19, 1/6). Proofs are furnished by the fact that children cry at the moment of birth (19, 7/8), and also by Holy Scripture (19, 9).

f. *Evolution of individual souls* (20).

The different evolutions of individual souls depend on external circumstances, but this influence only refers to *accidentia*; the real nature of the soul is identical with the soul of Adam as it was created by God.

g. *Refutation of the psychology of the Valentinians* (21).

The Valentinians wrongly distinguish three classes of men: *spirituales*, *animales*, and *materiales*; they try to trace the prototypes of these three classes back to the soul of Adam. However, in the soul of Adam the *animale* only was inherent in its nature, all other qualities being *accidentia* (21, 1/3). The Valentinian theory of the immutability of human nature, which excludes the freedom of the will, is based on an incorrect interpretation of scriptural passages (21, 4/7).

VI. Recapitulation of the first part (22).

C. Second part (23/37, 4): the origin of the soul.

I. Polemical part (23/4).

a. *Refutation of heretical theories on the origin of the soul* (23, 1/4); all these theories derive from Plato's doctrine of ἀνάμνησις (23, 5/6).

b. *Refutation of the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις*.

1. According to Plato the soul is a divine being; hence it cannot be capable of forgetting (24, 1/3).
2. The knowledge of the 'Forms' is said to belong to the *naturalia animae*; but even animals do not forget these *naturalia* (24, 4/7a).
3. Time cannot be the cause of forgetting (24, 7b/8a).
4. The body cannot be the cause of oblivion (24, 8b/10b).
5. If Plato were right, children would have the clearest recollection of the 'Forms' (24, 11a).
6. It is curious that only Plato himself possessed this ἀνάμνησις (24, 11b).

II. Positive part (25/7).

a. *The embryo an animate being* (25/6).

Opposite views (25, 1/2). Demonstration of the thesis by means of a) the *sensus communis* (25, 3/4); b) the experience of physicians (25, 5); c) the impossibility to derive $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ from $\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (25, 6/7); d) some other arguments, among which a passage from Plato and the view of astrologers (25, 8/9); e) Holy Scripture (26).

b. *The simultaneous origin of body and soul* (27).

Logical arguments (27, 2/3); demonstration from common experience (27, 4/6) and from Holy Scripture (27, 7/9).

III. Digression on the doctrine of metempsychosis (28/35).

a. *Demonstration that Pythagoras, the first author of this doctrine, was an impostor* (28).

b. *Refutation of the doctrines of Pythagoras and Plato* (29/31).

1. Plato's sentence $\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha \epsilon\zeta \epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\omega\nu$ has no validity (29).
2. If this theory were right, the number of human beings would have remained the same, which is contradicted by common experience (30).
3. In this case only one human being could spring from one other; but then it would be impossible for twins to be born (31, 1).
4. How are we to explain that the souls which died at different ages return at the same age? (31, 2).
5. If Plato were right, the souls would have remained unchanged during the interim; if this were true, how could the soul of the martial Euphorbus enter the peace-loving Pythagoras? (31, 3/4).
6. Why are so few cases of metempsychosis known? (31, 5/6).

c. *Refutation of the doctrine of Empedocles according to which a human soul can also enter an animal or a plant* (32).

1. The strong contrasts between living beings makes this theory *a priori* impossible (32, 1/7).
2. It is impossible to quote Ps. 48, 21 in support of this doctrine (32, 8/10).

d. *Refutation of the view that metempsychosis is to be regarded as a judgment after death* (33).

1. In this case the punishments would be too light, the rewards too small (33, 1/9).
2. The only possible judgment after death is the judgment of God (33, 10/1).

e. *Refutation of the cognate doctrines of Simon Magus* (34) *and Carpocrates* (35).

IV. Continuation of the positive part (36/37, 4).

- a. The soul obtains its sex at the moment of conception (36).
- b. The moulding of the embryo in the womb is watched over by angels (37, 1).
- c. The embryo is a ζῶον from the moment of attaining its final form (37,2).
- d. The time of birth and its symbolic value (37, 3/4).

D. Third part (37, 5/58, 8): further questions concerning the soul.

I. Growth of the soul (37, 5/7).

The soul grows along with the body, but only with regard to its powers.

II. Puberty (38).

Puberty begins at the age of fourteen for both body and soul (38, 1). At this moment the soul is invaded by sinful desires, which have not sprung from nature (38, 2). (The only natural desire is the desire for food, which, however, the soul only needs for the sake of the body: 38, 3/6).

III. Sin (39/41).

a. Already at birth the devil attacks the soul to corrupt it, the superstitious customs of the heathens practically inviting him to do so; hence no pagan soul is free from sin (39, 1/3). Children born of Christian parents are impure up to baptism, though they are privileged (39, 4).

b. Sin does not attach itself to the flesh, which is only a 'servant', but to the soul (40).

c. The soul is not only sinful through the operations of the 'devil', but also in consequence of original sin (41, 1). Nevertheless, the original good lives on in it and appears again, when at baptism the 'curtain of corruption' is pulled away (41, 2/4).

Interlude (42): announcement of the discussion on death; refutation of two pronouncements of Epicurus and Seneca.

IV. Sleep (43/4).

a. Sleep is perfectly natural; only the body sleeps (43, 118). Symbolic value of the sleep of Adam (43, 9/10) and of sleep in general (43, 11/2).

b. The case of Hermotimus: his soul did not leave his body during sleep, but his sleep was a particularly heavy one (44).

V. Dream (45/9).

a. During sleep the soul is not at rest, but it is not completely free either, the assistance of the body having been taken from it (45, 1/2). The dream is to be defined as a combination of sleep and

ecstasy, as is shown by its prototype (Gen. 2, 21) (45, 3/4). The force of memory remains unimpaired during sleep (45, 5/6).

b. Prophetic dreams (46, 1/9). Dream-interpreters and dream-oracles (46, 10/1). Influence of demons on dream-oracles (46, 12/3).

c. Dreams are caused by the demons, by God, or (perhaps) by the activity of the soul itself (47, 1/3). All further dreams are due to 'ecstasy' (47, 4).

d. External influences on dreams: the time of night, the season, the position of the body (48, 1/2). Uselessness of ascetic practices for obtaining prophetic dreams. The fasting of Daniel; the Montanistic view on this subject (48, 3/4).

e. Incorrectness of the view that certain classes of human beings (little children, the *Atlantes*) never dream (49).

VI. Death (50/3).

a. Refutation of Menander's assertion that by means of a baptism administered by him he could make people immortal (50).

b. Refutation of the view of Plato and Democritus that after death parts of the soul stay behind in the body (51, 1/5). Two remarkable cases which might seem to support this theory must be regarded as miracles (51, 6/8).

c. It is wrong to distinguish between a natural and an unnatural kind of death, death always being contrary to nature (52).

d. The soul leaves the body by degrees (53, 1/4); prophecies uttered by dying people are to be explained from this fact (53, 5/6).

VII. The fate of the soul after death (54/8).

a. General (54/5).

1. Refutation of the relevant theories of the Stoics, Arius, and Plato (54).

2. After death all souls enter hell, where they remain till the resurrection of the flesh; from this law only the souls of martyrs are excepted (55).

b. Special (56/8).

1. Refutation of the view that certain souls do not immediately enter hell, or that they can return thence.

α. Refutation of the theory that the souls of ἔταφοι (56, 2/3), ἄωροι (56, 4/7), and βιαιοθάνατοι (56, 8) roam about on earth. If this seems to be the case, it is due to tricks of demons (57, 3/5).

β. It is equally impossible that souls, after entering hell, return thence. The case of Saul and the witch of Endor. The story of Lazarus as counter-evidence (57, 6/12).

2. Reward and punishment of the souls during the interim (58, 1/8).

E. Epilogue (58, 9).

CHAPTER V

THE SOURCES USED IN *DE ANIMA*

§ 1. Introductory remarks.

Before I pass on to an investigation of the sources drawn on by Tert., I wish to point out that in this chapter I do not intend to discuss all the relevant particulars, the prefaces to the single chapters in the commentary, which start from detailed paraphrases, and hence are closely connected with the text, being better suited to this purpose. Here my task must be, first, to sum up what has been stated there, secondly, to give a more detailed description of the authorities consulted by Tert., and so of the place occupied by *De anima* in ancient and in Christian literature.

The first, also the most important, contribution to the solution of this question is found in Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 203/213. Diels showed the importance of Soranus as one of Tert.'s authorities, and defined the place occupied by his work *Περὶ ψυχῆς* in the evolution of doxographical literature; on the other hand, he omitted to investigate how far Tert. was dependent on Soranus.

Esser in his important monograph almost completely passed over the question of Tert.'s sources¹. This is due to the very same reason which ultimately made his book less useful for my investigations than I had expected. Esser was primarily a dogmatist, not a historian, so that his chief aim consisted in the construction of a system of Tert.'s psychology. This method cannot be regarded as the right one, Tert. being in the first place interested in whatever might endanger the Christian doctrine (or at least the point of view regarded by him as the Christian one), and so finding his chief task in the refutation of dangerous views: from no chapter of *De anima* are polemical discussions totally absent. From this it follows that, among his positive statements, a sharp distinction must be made between such utterances as represent his personal conviction, and pronouncements which owe their positive form to polemical intentions only. The construction of a system (which Tert. himself always avoided) from statements so unequal cannot but render Tert.'s views inexactly. The author of *De anima* is a polemic who never disavows the lawyer he was originally, and whose work should not be studied in the same way as a treatise by Hilary or Augustine².

The second, also the last, attempt to define the sources of *De anima*, which was made by H. Karpp (*Sorans vier Bücher Περὶ ψυχῆς und Tertullians Schrift De anima*, ZNTW 33 (1934), 31/47), advances our knowledge a good deal. After analysing exactly the contents of *De*

¹) He only takes into account the influence of the Stoics on Tert.

²) Cf. Klein, *Tertullian*, 332, note 250.

anima and comparing its composition to the structure of Aëtius' Ἀπείκοντα (which, just as Soranus' work, are based primarily on the so-called *Vetusta Placita*), Karpp shows Tert.'s dependence on Soranus in many places. Still his work has not made the present investigation superfluous, first, because Tert. used more authorities than Soranus; secondly, because for Soranus we have more materials at our disposal than were used by Karpp; thirdly, because we must also examine the question how Tert. worked up his materials.

§ 2. Soranus, Arius, and Albinus.

In order to start from incontrovertible data I first give the passages from *De anima* in which Tert. mentions the name of Soranus.

6,6. *De insignioribus argumentationibus erit etiam illa, quod omne corpus corporalibus ali iudicant (sc. Platonici), animam vero, ut incorporalem, incorporalibus, sapientiae scilicet studiis. Sed nec hic gradus stabit etiam Sorano methodicae medicinae instructissimo auctore respondente animam corporalibus quoque ali, denique deficientem a cibo plerumque fulciri. Quidni? quo adempto in totum dilabitur ex corpore. Ita etiam ipse Soranus plenissime super anima commentatus quattuor voluminibus et cum omnibus philosophorum sententiis expertus corporalem animae substantiam vindicat, etsi illam immortalitate fraudavit.* 6,7. *Sicut ergo Soranus ipse rebus ostendit animam corporalibus ali.*

8,3. *Aiunt enim et idcirco animam incorporalem renuntiandam, quia digressa ea graviora efficiantur corpora defunctorum, cum leviora esse deberent, unius corporis pondere exempto, si anima corpus. Quid enim, inquit Soranus, si mare negent corpus, quia extra mare immobilis et gravis navis efficitur?*

14, 2. *(dividitur anima) in septem (partes) a Sorano.*

15, 3. *Sed plures et philosophi adversus Dicaearchum . . . , et medici adversus Andream et Asclepiaden (qui principale animae abstulerunt): Herophilus, Erasistratus, Diocles, Hippocrates, et ipse Soranus.*

25, 5. *Hoc (sc. ἐμβρυοσφάκην) et Hippocrates habuit et Asclepiades et Erasistratus et maiorum quoque prosector Herophilus et mitior ipse Soranus.*

44, 2. *(What happened to Hermotimus) genus fuerat gravioris aliquanto soporis, ut de incubone praesumptio est vel de ea valetudinis labe quam Soranus opponit excludens incubonem.*

The first passage, which is undoubtedly the most important one, shows, first, that Tert. consulted the four books Περὶ ψυχῆς, secondly, that in these books Soranus combated numerous contrary views of philosophers concerning the soul. Since no fragments of this treatise have been preserved, it is impossible to draw further conclusions from these data, unless an idea is formed of Soranus' activity and of the characteristics of his work in general; this task is greatly facilitated by E. Kind's article 'Soranus', R. E. II: 3, 1113/30. It stands to reason that I shall pass over whatever is immaterial to the present subject.

Soranus being the most famous adherent of the so-called 'methodical' school of physicians, we shall first give a condensed account of the evolution and the fundamental theses of this school; for more detailed descriptions we may refer to L. Edelstein, art. 'Methodiker', R. E. *Suppl.* VI, 358/73, to M. Wellmann, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 396/414, and especially to the monograph by Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Das medizinische System der Methodiker, Eine Vorstudie zu Caelius Aurelianus "De morbis acutis et chronicis"* (Jenaer medizin-historische Beiträge, Heft 7/8, Jena 1916).

As the precursor of the μεθοδικοί we must regard the famous physician Asclepiades of Prusa (Bithynia), who about 91 B.C. settled down at Rome. He was an advocate of atomism, not, however, of the form given to it by Democritus and Epicurus, but almost certainly (see Überweg-Prächter, 445) of the doctrine of Heraclides Ponticus, who, instead of ἄτομα, assumed ἀναρμοὶ ὄγκοι (i. e., 'unconnected molecules', separated from one another by a vacuum). According to Asclepiades, the human body, too, consists of such molecules¹, which are in continuous motion and are separated from each other by invisible canals². He rejected the pathology of the school of Hippocrates, which primarily took into account the body-fluids, and for the explanation of diseases paid attention mainly³ to the solid parts of the organism, i. e., the tissues consisting of these ὄγκοι; the greater part of existing diseases he regarded as originating from a 'stoppage of the molecules'⁴.

Asclepiades' pupil Themison of Laodicea is the founder of the methodical school. His entire theory was based on the following sentence: "the only criterion which a physician has consists in the φαινόμενα, i. e., such data as are immediately furnished by the senses; the ἀδηλα, i. e., such causes of diseases as are not immediately evident, are immaterial to him". It follows that Themison could not adopt the doctrine of Asclepiades concerning the πόροι λόγω θεωρητοί; so he replaced these by πόροι αἰσθητοί, ἐναργῶς φαινόμενοι.⁵ He simplified the system of Asclepiades by deriving all diseases from an unnatural condition of the πόροι, according as they were too wide or too narrow. This led him to assume two chief forms of diseases (γενικά πάθη⁶), viz., στέγνωσις (*genus adstrictum* Cels., *strictura* Cael. Aurel.), which means an excessive tension of the tissues, and ῥύσις or τὸ ῥοῶδες (*genus fluens* Cels., *solutio* Cael. Aurel.), an excessive

¹) Soran. *gynaec.* 3, 3, 5 (95, 23/5 Ilberg): οἱ δὲ Ἀσκληπιάδαιοι κατασκευάζοντες ὡς οὐδὲν ἔστιν πάθος ἴδιον γυναικῶν φασιν, ὅτι τὸ θῆλυ τοῖς ἄρρεσιν ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν συγκεκρίται, στοιχείων ὡσπερ, τῶν ὄγκων.

²) πόροι λόγω θεωρητοὶ or νοητοὶ πόροι (Sext. *Empir.*).

³) But not exclusively; see the refutation of Wellmann's view (*Neue Jahrb.* 21 (1909), 701) by Meyer-Steineg (*op. cit.*, 92).

⁴) Galen VII, 615 Kühn: ἐμφράξειςιν ὄγκων ἐν πόροις; cf. also the detailed discussion of this subject by Caelius Aurelianus, *acut. morb.* 1, 14, 107 *seq.*

⁵) Galen XVIII A, 296 Kühn.

⁶) Galen XIV, 680 Kühn.

relaxation of the same. A third form was called by him the 'mixed condition' (τὸ ἐπιπεπλεγμένον, ἡ μικτὴ κοινότης, *genus mixtum* Cels., *complexio stricture et solutionis* Cael. Aurel.); this appears when one part of the body suffers from στένωσις, another from ῥύσις. These three forms he called κοινότητες; they could be regarded as φαινόμενα, because they might be known from the condition of the excretions of the body¹. With regard to the duration of diseases he made a distinction between acute and chronic ones; the former he referred to στένωσις, the latter to ῥύσις. Finally, he distinguished three stages of diseases: increase (ἐπίδοσις), arrest (ἄκμῃ), and decline (παρακμῇ). The chief task of a physician he believed to consist in stimulating a condition contrary to the influence of the disease: in the case of στένωσις he ought to bring about a relaxation (χαλᾶν; ἀραιώσις, χαύνωσις), in the opposite case a 'contraction' (στέλλειν; πύκνωσις); if the patient suffered from the *genus mixtum*, he ought to remove the dominating κοινότης².

Of philosophical systems Scepticism was the nearest to this doctrine, for, whereas the so-called empirical physicians plainly denied the existence of ἀδήλα, the μεθοδικοί only recommended ἐποχή, i. e., a suspension of judgment. This similarity was clearly expressed by Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 236/7: ("we must not put Scepticism on a level with the empirical school of physicians, which περὶ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας τῶν ἀδήλων διαβεβαιούται") μᾶλλον δὲ τὴν καλουμένην μέθοδον, ὥς ἔμοι δοκεῖ, δύναίτο ἂν μετιέναι· αὕτη γὰρ μόνη τῶν κατὰ ἰατρικὴν αἰρέσεων περὶ μὲν τῶν ἀδήλων δοκεῖ μὴ προπετεῦσθαι, πότερον καταληπτὰ ἔστιν ἢ ἀκατάληπτα λέγειν αὐθαδεῖαζομένη, τοῖς δὲ φαινόμενοις ἐπομένῃ ἀπὸ τούτων λαμβάνει τὸ συμφέρειν δοκοῦν κατὰ τὴν τῶν σκεπτικῶν ἀκολουθίαν.

It is not impossible that Wellmann is right in supposing³ that the founder (or the founders) of the methodical school was influenced by Aenesidemus; at any rate, this Sceptic was an important authority for Soranus (see below p. 30*).

As in philosophy the Sceptics were midway between the δογματικοί and the ἀναιροῦντες, the adherents of the methodical school adopted a middle course between the 'dogmatic' and the 'empirical' physicians: on the one hand, they regarded their fundamental theses as 'knowledge' (ἐνδειξις), not merely as 'observation' (τήρησις), as was done by the 'empiricals'; on the other hand, they diverged from the 'dogmatics' by deriving this 'knowledge' exclusively from the φαινόμενα⁴.

It follows that a methodical physician knew no more than three

¹) Galen I, 176 and XIV, 680 Kühn.

²) For further particulars, see Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 401/3; Meyer-Steineg, *op. cit.*, 22/5.

³) *op. cit.*, 403; he supposes that Themison was directly influenced by Aenesidemus.

⁴) Cels., *prooem.* (10, 9/13 Daremb.): *Ac neque rationalibus se neque experimenta tantum spectantibus adnumerari volunt: quum ab illis eo nomine dissentiant, quod in conjectura rerum latentium nolunt esse medicinam; ab his eo, quod parum artis esse in observatione experimentorum credunt.* See also Edelstein, 367.

kinds of diseases, which were always regarded as diseases of the whole body; hence he neither needed to know from what particular cause the disease had sprung, nor what particular part of the body was ill. This made a knowledge of anatomy and physiology superfluous for him ¹.

However, the methodical school did not stick to its original views ². During the reign of Vespasian, Olympicus of Miletus, at that time head of the school in Alexandria, brought about an important change by connecting the original theory with the dogmatism of the so-called 'pneumatic' school. As adherents of this νέα μέθοδος are mentioned the two heads of the school after Olympicus, Apollonides of Cyprus and Julian of Alexandria, and, in addition to these, Menemachus of Aphrodisias and Soranus ³. Characteristic features of this school are, first, its eclecticism, which resulted in an important extension of the original doctrine ⁴, secondly, an almost exaggerated propensity to criticize the views of earlier and contemporary physicians ⁵, and thirdly, its close relation to Stoic philosophy. Julian even called himself a Stoic (Galen XVIII A, 298 Kühn: καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἄλλην τινὸς ἔννοιαν εἰπεῖν ἔχει τοῦ συνέχοντος αἰτίου παρὰ τὸ γίνεσθαι τι πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ παύεσθαι σὺν αὐτῷ, πλὴν εἰ κἀνταῦθα πάλιν ἐξαίφνης ἅπαντων εἶναι φησι Στωικόν, ὥς ἐν ἄλλοις ἐποίησεν).

According to Wellmann (*op. cit.*, 410), this qualification was due primarily to the close connection between the methodical and the pneumatic school which was strongly influenced by the Stoics. The chief adherents of the latter school, viz., Agathinus, Magnus, and Archigenes were even regarded by Soranus (Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 2, 10, 58) as μεθοδικοί; for the influence of the Stoa on the psychological views of the 'methodics', see below, p. 33*.

This brings us to Soranus. Concerning his life we have two short accounts in Suidas ⁶ s.v.: 1) Σωρανὸς Μενάνδρου καὶ Φοίβης Ἐφέσιος ἱατρὸς διατρίψας ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ δὲ ἱατρεύσας ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ καὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τῶν βασιλέων, βιβλία τε συντάξας πλείστα καὶ κάλλιστα; 2) Σωρανὸς Ἐφέσιος ἱατρὸς νεώτερος. Γυναικεία βιβλία δ', βίους ἱατρῶν καὶ αἰρέσεις καὶ συντάγματα βιβλία δέκα· καὶ ἄλλα διάφορα.

His position within the methodical school (unfortunately his work *Περὶ κοινότητων* is lost) seems to be best qualified by the words of

¹) See the discussion of this subject by Edelstein, 365; however, his assertion that the (original) μεθοδικοί did not take into account the age of their patients nor the influence of the climate, may be wrong (cf. e. g., Cels., p. 28, 28/34 Daremb.).

²) I cannot subscribe to Meyer-Steineg's supposition (*op. cit.*, 31; Arch. f. Gesch. d. Mediz., 1910/1, 89/118) that Thessalus extended the sense of the term κοινότης by defining κοινότης as 'chief indication'.

³) Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 406.

⁴) This, however, does not hold good of Soranus; cf. p. 26*.

⁵) Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 409.

⁶) That these two accounts refer to the same physician, has been demonstrated by O. Scheele, *De Sorano Ephesio medico etymologo* (dissertation Strassburg 1884), 3 seqq.

Meyer-Steineg (*op. cit.*, 38/9), "that he resisted the efforts of numerous adherents of the methodical school to mix up the doctrine of the κοινότητες, which was originally drawn up for the sake of pathology only, with normal physiological conceptions; on the contrary, he consistently kept these two things apart". In this context we may quote his statement on anatomy, *gyn.* 1, 2, 5 (6, 6/11 Ilberg): ἥτις (sc. ἡ ἀνατομή) εἰ καὶ ἄχρηστός ἐστιν, ὅμως ἐπεὶ παραλαμβάνεται χρηστομαθείας ἕνεκα, διδάξομεν καὶ τὰ ἐκ ταύτης ἐπιγνωσθέντα. ῥαδίως τε γὰρ πιστευθῆσόμεθα λέγοντες ἄχρηστον τὴν ἀνατομήν, εἰ πρότερον αὐτὴν εἰδότες εὐρεθείημεν, καὶ οὐ παρέξομεν ὑπόνοιαν τοῦ δι' ἄγνοιαν παραιτεῖσθαι τι τῶν ὑπειλημμένων εὐχρήστων. In the same sense we may interpret his words on the φυσικὸς λόγος (i. e. περὶ σπέρματος καὶ ζωογονίας) in the preface to the Γυναικεία (2, 3 = 4, 6/8 Ilberg): τὸν μὲν οὖν φυσικὸν ἄχρηστον ὄντα πρὸς τὸ τέλος¹, φερέκοσμον δὲ πρὸς χρησιμομάθειαν, κεχωρίκαμεν ἐντεῦθεν (i. e. 'from this work'), μόνον πρὸς τὸ παρὸν ἐχόμενοι τῶν ἀναγκαίων. Undoubtedly this attitude meant a reaction against the line taken by Olympicus.

The most striking characteristic of Soranus' work was his interest in anything connected with the history of medicine. This interest is shown in the first place by his great work Βίοι ἱατρῶν καὶ αἰρέσεις καὶ συντάγματα βιβλία ι' (Suid.; τῶν ἱατρῶν διαδοχαί, *schol.* Oribas.; see Kind, 1115/6). The first part of the title is immediately clear; the συντάγματα were probably a collection of the views of famous physicians on all kinds of subjects. I note here already (for further details see p. 27*) that one of his authorities was the Alexandrian physician Andreas. If Wellmann is right in asserting that the *Papyrus Londinensis* 137, which has been edited by Diels², derives from a lecture by Soranus³, we must put this work in the same class of his writings.

The same interest in the history of his art is shown by the work Περί ὀξέων καὶ χρόνιων παθῶν, of which we possess a Latin adaptation⁴ in the three books *celerum sive acutarum passionum* and the five books *tardarum sive chronicarum passionum* by Caelius Aurelianus. Here descriptions of the characteristics of every disease and of its treatment are followed regularly by a critical discussion of the views of earlier physicians, these views nearly always being rejected. In most cases these are quoted in a definite order viz., Hippocrates, Diocles, Praxagoras, Erasistratus, Herophilus, Heraclides of Tarent, Asclepiades, Themison, and Thessalus; for omissions from this enumeration a reason is usually given (see Wellmann, *Hermes* 36 (1901), 141.).

¹) Meyer-Steineg (*op. cit.*, 39) is certainly wrong in supposing that here this word means: 'the ultimate aim (of medical science)'; Soranus means 'the present aim', i. e., the training of midwives.

²) *Anonymi Londinensis ex Aristotelis Iatricis Menonitis et aliis medicis eclogae*, ed. H. Diels (Supplem. Arist., III, 1, Berolini 1893).

³) However, Wellmann has hardly succeeded in furnishing conclusive arguments for his view (see Kind, 1116, and Meyer-Steineg, 81.).

⁴) *Acut. morb.* 2, 1, 8: Soranus . . . cuius haec sunt quae latinizanda suscepimus; *ib.*, 2, 10, 65.

The physician Andreas, too, is mentioned twice. Of the philosophers Democritus is quoted four times, Aristotle twice, Empedocles, Parmenides and Plato once each.

A second peculiarity of Soranus' work to be mentioned here consists in his continual references to etymology. To this subject he even devoted a special treatise, *Περὶ ἔτυμολογιῶν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (Orion *Etymolog.* 34, 9; 131, 4; 159, 18 Sturz), numerous fragments of which are still extant¹. Probably he dealt not only with derivations of the names of the parts of the body, but also with definitions and denominations². It is not certain whether in this context he also discussed the functions of body and soul, as has been supposed by Kind (*op. cit.*, 1117) and Voigt (*op. cit.*, see note 1)³. At all events, it is important to the present discussion that of the Greek philosophers Soranus cited Plato, Aristotle, Heraclides Ponticus, and Chrysippus, of the poets Empedocles and Epicharmus, verses of whom are quoted. In the extant works and remains of Soranus this interest in etymology is frequently found; a particularly striking example is furnished by the explanation of the name *synanche* in Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 3, 1, 1. For similar passages from the *Γυναικεῖα* see Voigt 24/32 (according to the table of contents, chapter 166, now lost, had the title *Περὶ κατασκευῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὀνόμασις πάντων τῶν μελῶν καὶ τῶν στοιχείων*).

The *Γυναικεῖα βιβλία δ'*, the only work of Soranus which for the greater part is still extant⁴, do not furnish much material for the present investigation, because here the author purposely avoids all theoretical expositions, a more general discussion of procreation being reserved for a special treatise *Περὶ σπέρματος καὶ ζωογονίας*. For the interpretation of *De anima* it is particularly unfortunate that this work, too, is lost; a certain compensation is given by the treatise of the so-called Vindicianus⁵, which contains the Latin translation of fairly considerable fragments⁶ in which the following authors are quoted: Alexander Philalethes, Diogenes of Apollonia, Diocles, the Stoics, Hippocrates, Herophilus, Erasistratus, Asclepiades, and Aristotle. In the *Γυναικεῖα* Hippocrates, Diocles, Herophilus, his pupil Demetrius, Asclepiades, and Themison are quoted more than five times, Alexander Philalethes and Andreas twice.

¹) Unfortunately these fragments have not yet been collected. A survey of the materials is given by Kind, 1117/8. Two monographs on this work have been published: P. Voigt, *Sorani Ephesii liber de etymologiis corporis humani quatenus restitui possit* (dissertation Greifswald 1882); D. Scheele, *De Sorano Ephesio medico etymologo* (dissertation Strassburg 1884).

²) Cf. Voigt, 32/3; he supposes (*ib.*, 26) that the title was: *Περὶ ὀνομασιῶν καὶ ἔτυμολογιῶν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*.

³) It is more likely that the passages quoted by Voigt derive from *Περὶ ψυχῆς*.

⁴) Edition by J. Ilberg, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, IV, Lipsiae-Berolini 1927; for the tradition, see Kind, 1118/9.

⁵) Preserved in *Cod. Bruzelli*. 1348/1359 (twelfth century).

⁶) Editions by Wellmann, *Frag. d. gr. Ärzte*, 1, 208 *seqq.* and by Jaeger, *Diokles von Karystos*, 191/8; Jaeger adds an excellent Greek translation of the fragments.

The title of the treatise *Περὶ παθῶν αἰτιῶν* or *Αἰτιολογούμενα*, which seems to have been a very extensive one, clearly shows that the position taken up by Soranus differed from the original views of the *μεθοδικοί*, who regarded the knowledge of the special causes of diseases as superfluous (cf. p. 25*). This work is quoted twice by Caelius Aurelianus (which means that Soranus quotes his own work). It is rather curious that both quotations refer to subjects which are also mentioned in *De anima*, viz., a natural explanation of nightmares¹, and the views of famous philosophers and physicians concerning the seat of the soul². The most plausible supposition is that Soranus both in the work *Περὶ ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν* and in *Περὶ ψυχῆς* repeated some particulars from the treatise under discussion, for it can hardly be assumed that, besides *Περὶ ψυχῆς*, Tert. should have consulted other works by him. In this connection particular importance must be attached to the aetiological part of the so-called *Anonymus Darembergii sive Fuchsii*³, because its doxographical contents are certainly somehow connected with Soranus' work. It is especially for ch. 15 (the *ἡγεμονικόν*) that numerous parallels may be quoted from this source.

Thus four characteristic features of Soranus' work may be mentioned: his interest in the history of his art, his predilection for etymology, his propensity to contest the opinions of earlier physicians, and finally the wideness of his views, which frequently made him overstep the limits of the original doctrine of the methodical school without becoming unfaithful to its fundamental principles. To these may be added a keen interest in philosophy, especially in the doctrine of Democritus⁴. His aversion from surgery and vivisection, which is to be expected in an adherent of the methodical school, can be deduced from *De anima* (see the notes on 10, 4 and 25, 5).

From the data discussed till now we may conclude with Diels (*Dox. gr.*, 204) that the very rich doxographical material contained in *De anima* derives from Soranus. This supposition is especially supported by the circumstance that besides philosophers Tert. usually also quotes physicians; moreover, all these physicians, with the exception of two⁵, are frequently mentioned in Soranus' works.

¹) Cael. Aurel. *morb. chron.* 1, 3, 55 and Tert. *an.* 44, 2 (cf. comm., p. 478); Soranus probably rejected an *ἄδηλον αἶτιον*.

²) Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 1, 8, 54 (in a discussion on *phrenitis*)—Tert. *an.* 15.

³) According to Diels (Sitz. Ber. Berlin 1893, 102₂), the doxographical matter found in the *Anonymus* (published by R. Fuchs, Rhein. Mus. 49, 540) is derived from Soranus. This view was contested by Fuchs, *De anonymo Parisino quem putant esse Soranum* (Festschrift Vahlen (1900), 141 seqq.). Wellmann (*Zu den Αἰτιολογούμενα des Soranus*, Hermes 36 (1901), 140/55) supposed Soranus himself to be the author; this supposition too was combated by Fuchs (Rhein. Mus. 58, 67), who himself regarded Themison as the author (*Handb. d. Gesch. d. Mediz.*, 1, 331 seq.). Finally, Wellmann ascribed the treatise to a certain Herodotus, an adherent of the 'pneumatic' school (Hermes 40, 580/604 and 48, 141/3); this view was shared by Kind, 1127.

⁴) For further particulars on this subject, see p. 34*.

⁵) These few exceptions become still less important, when we consider how little of Soranus' work is still extant.

Asclepiades is mentioned five times, Herophilus four times, Hippocrates and Erasistratus three times, Diocles and Andreas (who is quoted frequently only by Soranus) twice, Praxagoras¹, Strato (the pupil of Erasistratus), and Chrysippus (the pupil of Philistion) once. Only two are less known, viz., Hicesius, who is twice violently attacked, and the totally unknown Apollodorus.

We owe it to Diels that Soranus' position in the tradition of doxographical literature is on the whole clear. The material worked up in *Περὶ ψυχῆς* belongs to a twofold tradition. All collections of *δόγματα* referring to medicine eventually derive from the *Ἱατρικὴ συναγωγὴ* usually ascribed to Aristotle but composed by his pupil Meno². A very important link in the tradition extending from Meno to Soranus was the compilation called *Ἀρέσκοντα τοῖς ἱατροῖς* by Alexander Philalethes, an author quoted by Soranus and the so-called Vindicianus. Of course we must not lose sight of the fact that Soranus did not owe his knowledge to such compilations only, but must also have studied the originals; his knowledge of the therapeutic methods of his predecessors, as shown by Caelius Aurelianus, is much too extensive to have been borrowed from such schematic surveys alone.

In the case of philosophy, where our materials are less scanty, the development of doxographical literature may be described more exactly on the ground of Diels' investigations³. Here the primary source was the *Φυσικῶν δόξων βιβλία* *γ'*⁴ by Theophrastus, which in the time of Cicero were enlarged, probably by a pupil of Posidonius⁵. This enlarged redaction is usually called the *Vetusta Placita*; the last philosopher mentioned in it is Posidonius. The enlargement not only comprised the *δόξαι* of philosophers of the Hellenistic period, but also the relevant views of the most famous physicians, the last of these being Asclepiades; probably the redactor used the work of Meno for the classical period⁶.

¹) It is true that in 15, 6 Tert. writes *Protagoras*, but from the context it is clear (cf. comm., p. 229) that Soranus must have mentioned Praxagoras.

²) Galen XV, 25 Kühn: ὥσπερ γε πάλιν εἰ τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν δόξας ἐθέλοις ἱστορῆσαι, πάρεστί σοι τὰς τῆς Ἱατρικῆς συναγωγῆς ἀναγνῶναι βίβλους ἐπιγεγραμμένας μὲν Ἀριστοτέλει, ὁμολογουμένας δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μένωνος ὅς ἦν μαθητῆς αὐτοῦ γεγράφθαι, διὸ καὶ Μενώνεια προσαγορεύουσιν ἔνιοι ταυτὶ τὰ βιβλία; cf. Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 232 and Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1893, 102.

³) In the *Prolegomena* to his edition of the *Doxographi Graeci*.

⁴) For the title, see Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 102.

⁵) Diels, Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1893, 102.

⁶) Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 232. — The only point not made clear by Diels is the relation between Alexander Philalethes and the compiler of the *Vetusta Placita*. He rightly rejects (*op. cit.*, 185) Rose's view (*Arist. pseudopigr.*, 381) that they are identical but the following words (Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1893, 102) are disputable: "Diesem Stadium der Tradition (viz. the redaction of the *Vetusta Placita*) entsprechen auf der medicinischen Seite die *Ἀρέσκοντα* des Alexander Philalethes. Die nächste Stufe bilden dann unter Trajan die philosophischen *Ἀρέσκοντα* des Aëtios und auf medicinischer Seite die doxographischen Excerpte des Soran". It is true that the work of Aëtius contains in the first place *δόξαι* of philosophers, but it also gives numerous *δόγματα* of physicians. Since it is quite certain that the *Vetusta Placita* were the main source for Aëtius, we must assume

The *Vetusta Placita* were the chief source of the 'Ἀρέσκοντα of the so-called Aëtius, which must have been composed about 100 A.D., and which Diels has reconstructed¹. I pass over the highly complicated question concerning the use made of this work by other authors, because it is immaterial to the present investigation², and proceed to a discussion of Soranus.

From the fact that much of the doxographical material contained in *De anima* corresponds with the data given by Aëtius, Diels rightly concluded that Soranus used the material contained in the *Vetusta Placita* for his treatise Περὶ ψυχῆς. He also went even further. In *De anima* Aenesidemus the Sceptic is quoted three times, and Heraclitus, who had a special importance for Aenesidemus, no less than seven times. Since, moreover, the discussion on the uniformity of the soul in 14, 5 is perfectly similar to a passage from Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. mathem.* 7, 349), which undoubtedly derives from Aenesidemus³, and a doxographical note in 9, 5 only becomes intelligible if it is assumed that Soranus consulted this famous Sceptic⁴, Diels arrives at the conclusion that Soranus became acquainted with the contents of the *Vetusta Placita* through the intermediary of Aenesidemus. It is evident that for a Sceptic a collection of δόξαι was particularly useful to his purpose of showing up the διαφορὰ τῶν δογματικῶν; thus Clitomachus⁵ and Philo of Larissa⁶ made extensive use of Theophrastus' Φυσικῶν δόξων βιβλία. According to Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 212) some physician who was an adherent of the Sceptics must be assumed as intermediary between Aenesidemus and Soranus; however, for this supposition (which, of course, only serves the purpose of connecting the Sceptic with the physician) no valid arguments can be advanced. As the philosophy of Aenesidemus was very popular among the Romans, it is quite possible that at Rome Soranus (we should not forget his interest in history!) consulted the work of the famous Sceptic himself. At any rate, it is obvious that Soranus knew the *Vetusta Placita* through the intermediary of the Sceptics; this fact is in perfect accordance with the close relations between the Sceptics and the methodical school (cf. p. 24*).

I proceed now to a comparison of the contents of *De anima* with those of the corresponding part of the 'Ἀρέσκοντα of Aëtius (books IV and V). It is true that such a comparison has already been made

a twofold use made of the tradition inaugurated by the Μεγίστοι, viz., a very large one by Alexander and a much less extensive one in the *Vetusta Placita*; but in this case it is impossible to draw as sharp a distinction between the two works as is done by Diels. It stands to reason that for Soranus the data from the *Vetusta Placita* referring to physicians were of no importance compared to those from his other sources.

¹ Edition by Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 267/444.

² Cf. *Dox. Gr.*, 45/69.

³ For further particulars, cf. comm. *ad loc.*, p. 217.

⁴ Cf. Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 209/10.

⁵ Diels, *op. cit.*, 121; Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skeptiz.*, 95; Susemihl, *Lit. Alex.*, 180₆₄₄.

⁶ Goedeckemeyer, *op. cit.*, 117.

by Karpp (p. 42/3); still it seems useful to give this survey once more, as in many details my views are different. I add the corresponding data from the contents of the *Vetusta Placita* as reconstructed by Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 182).

Tert. <i>d e a n.</i>	Aëtius	<i>Vet. Plac.</i>
1—3. Preface.	—	—
4. The <i>initium animae</i>	—	—
5/9. Corporeality of the soul.	4, 3. Εἰ σῶμα ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τίς ἡ οὐσία αὐτῆς.	= Aëtius ¹
10/14. Uniformity of the soul; its parts.	4, 4. Π. μερῶν τῆς ψυχῆς. (for ch. 10 perhaps, 4, 22: Π. ἀναπνοῆς).	= Aëtius ¹ (4, 22. Π. ἀναπνοῆς)
15. The ἡγεμονικόν	4, 5. Π. ἡγεμονικοῦ. (cf. 4, 21).	= Aëtius ¹
16. The ἄλογον according to Plato.	—	—
17. Sense - perception.	4, 8. Π. αἰσθήσεως καὶ αἰσθητῶν. 4, 9. Εἰ ἀληθεῖς αἱ αἰσθήσεις καὶ φαντασίαι.	4, 8/10. Π. αἰσθήσεως καὶ αἰσθητῶν.
18. The acquiring of knowledge through the mind (polemic against Valentinus and Plato).	—	—
19. The completeness of the soul at the moment of birth.	(5, 23. Πότε ἄρχεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς τελειότητος).	(5, 23; = Aëtius)
20. The influence of external circumstances on the evolution of the soul.	—	—
21. Refutation of the psychology of the Valentinians; the freedom of the will.	—	—
22. Recapitulation of ch. 4/21.	—	—
23/24. Digression: refutation of Gnostic theories concerning the soul and of the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις.	—	—

¹) We may assume that in the *Vetusta Placita* these subjects were discussed in these places, though Diels omits to mention them.

<i>Tert. de a n.</i>	<i>Aëtius</i>	<i>Vet. Plac.</i>
25/26. Demonstration that the embryo is an animate being.	5, 15. Εἰ τὸ ἐμβρυον ζῶον.	5, 15; = Aëtius.
27. The simultaneous origin of body and soul; procreation.	5, 3. Τίς ἡ οὐσία σπέρματος. 5, 4. Εἰ σῶμα τὸ σπέρμα. 5, 5. Εἰ καὶ αἱ θήλειαι προτενται σπέρμα. 5, 6. Πῶς αἱ συλλήψεις γίνονται.	5, 3/5. Π. σπέρματος. 5, 6. Π. συλλήψεως.
28/35. Refutation of the doctrine of metempsychosis.	—	—
36. The sex of the soul.	—	—
37. Further particulars concerning the soul of the embryo. The duration of pregnancy. The vitality of children born in the seventh and eighth months of pregnancy. Growth of the soul.	5, 16. Πῶς τρέφεται τὰ ἐμβρυα. 5, 18. Διὰ τί τὰ ἑπταμηνιαῖα γόνιμα. 5, 21. Ἐν πόσῳ χρόνῳ μορφοῦται τὰ ζῶα ἐν γαστρὶ ὄντα.	5, 16 <i>seqq.</i> ; = Aëtius.
38. Puberty.	5, 23. Πότε ἄρχεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς τελειότητος (partly \simeq ch. 19).	5, 23; = Aëtius.
Nourishment.	5, 26. Π. τροφῆς καὶ αὐξήσεως.	5, 27. Π. τροφῆς.
39/41. The influence of sin.	—	—
42. (Preface to the discussion on death).	—	—
43/44. Sleep.	5, 24. Πῶς ὕπνος γίνεται καὶ θάνατος. 5, 25. Ποτέρου ἐστὶν ὕπνος καὶ θάνατος, ψυχῆς ἢ σώματος.	5, 24/5. Π. ὕπνου καὶ θανάτου.
45/46. The dream; its value as a prophecy.	5, 1. Π. μαντικῆς.	5, 1; = Aëtius.
	5, 2. Πῶς ὄνειροι γίνονται.	5, 2; = Aëtius.
50/53. Death.	see <i>ad</i> 43/4.	see <i>ad</i> 43/4.
54/58. The fate of the soul after death.	4, 7. Π. ἀφθαρσίας ψυχῆς.	—

As is shown by this survey, the structure of *De anima* corresponds in general with that of the Ἀπέκοντα of Aëtius and of the *Vetusta Placita*¹. The most important difference is that in the *Vetusta Placita* the dream is discussed earlier, because it belongs to the section Περὶ ψυχῆς (see Diels, *op. cit.*, 182/3), whereas Tert. appends it to his description of sleep, which in doxographical literature is discussed in the book Περὶ σώματος. Moreover, in *De anima* eschatology is dealt with at the end², while Aëtius treats the immortality of the soul in his fourth book (Περὶ ψυχῆς). At all events, we are justified in assuming that Tert. adopted from Soranus the order of discussion of the following subjects: corporeality of the soul—unity of the soul and parts of the soul—ἡγεμονικόν—sense-perception—origin of the soul, the soul of the embryo—puberty of the soul—sleep—death. On the other hand, it seems impossible to state anything more definite about the structure of Soranus' work³.

Our first task now is to determine what Tert. borrowed from Soranus. From this investigation the following chapters, which undoubtedly either derive from other sources or are to be ascribed to Tert. himself, must be excepted: 1—3⁴, 7, 11, 21, 22, 23 (§§ 1/4), 26, 34/5, 39/41, 44/9, 55, and 58. It stands to reason that we should start from what is absolutely certain. In the first place we must mention the passages which contain the name of Soranus (see p. 22). From these we learn that he regarded the soul as corporeal and mortal (6, 6; 8, 3; see also the comm. on 8, 4), assumed it to be nourished by corporeal food (6, 6; 38, 3, where the word *argumentator* certainly refers to him), and ascribed to it seven parts (14, 2) and a central organ, the ἡγεμονικόν (15, 3). This is sufficient evidence to show that he was strongly influenced by Stoic philosophy⁵. Tert. adopts his views with the exception of his division of the soul and his assumption that the soul is directly nourished by corporeal food.

A second group of certain data consists of doxographical notes⁶, which may be enumerated here: 1) ch. 5 (arguments for the corporeality of the soul)⁷; 2) 9, 5 (the views of various philosophers, among them Aenesidemus and Heraclitus '*secundum quosdam*', on the substance of the soul); 3) 12, 2 (Anaxagoras and Aristotle's views concerning the νοῦς); 4) 14, 2 (the number of parts of the soul); 5) 15 (the ἡγεμονικόν); 6) 17, 2/4 (various δόξαι concerning sense-perception);

¹) Of course the second and third columns of this survey contain more gaps than the survey given by Karpp, because I have entered the entire contents of *De anima*.

²) Cf. 42, 1: *De morte iam superest, ut illic materia ponat, ubi ipsa anima consummat*.

³) According to Karpp (p. 42), four parts are easily ('zwanglos') found: condition of the soul—its origin—sleep—death. He thinks it probable that in each of the four books one of these subjects was discussed—but in that case the books must have been very unequal in length!

⁴) Perhaps an exception should be made for chapter 2; cf. pp. 36* and 97/8.

⁵) Cf. the discussion of these passages in the commentary.

⁶) This does not mean that Soranus found all these facts in the *Vetusta Placita*.

⁷) For all facts concerning Plato's philosophy, cf. pp. 41*/4*.

7) 19, 2 (Aristotle and the Stoics on the life of plants and on the souls of children); 8) 25, 2 (the Stoics and Aenesidemus on the entrance of the soul into the body at the moment of birth); 9) 38, 1 (Asclepiades on puberty); 10) 43, 2 (δόξα concerning sleep); 11) 51, 2 (Democritus on the remaining behind of parts of the soul in the body after death); 54, 1/2 (immortality of the soul; abode of the soul after death)¹. In 32, 4 (*si et atomos Epicuri*, etc.) and 25, 5, the long enumerations of names may be the work of Tert. himself; the data contained in 46, 2/3 have probably been taken from another authority (see pp. 44*/5*).

It would serve no useful purpose here to sum up all the philosophers who are mentioned in *De anima*²; I only point out the more important particulars. Of the philosophers Plato is mentioned most frequently, which is primarily due to the fact that Tert. regarded him as the *condimentarius haereticorum* (23, 5); hence it would not be right to assume *a priori* that all the passages in which he is quoted, derive from Soranus³. In the case of all the other philosophers, however, this supposition seems admissible. Tert. very frequently mentions the Stoics, whose doctrine of the materiality of the soul was adopted by both Soranus and himself; it is only their views on sense-perception and the fate of the soul after death which are rejected by him. Next to the Stoics we may mention Aristotle, who is completely ignored by Tert. in his other works, but in *De anima* is quoted twelve times⁴. Heraclitus is mentioned seven times (twice with the addition *secundum quosdam*, which betrays the influence of Aenesidemus⁵), Democritus⁶ four times. The last philosophers who are quoted are Posidonius (just as in the *Vetusta Placita*, cf. p. 29*) and Arius (see pp. 38* *seqq.*).

Next an attempt may be made on the ground of what is known about Soranus to define more exactly how far Tert. was influenced by him. Here I must differ frequently from Karpp, who in my opinion is too easily inclined to ascribe whole chapters to the Ephesian for no other reasons than that they may derive from him and that Tert. did make extensive use of his work. It should always be remembered that Tert. was a highly obstinate and original character, who, when borrowing views or facts from others, usually adapted them most carefully to his special purposes⁷. Therefore an investigation of his sources must proceed gradually, and must continually distinguish what is certain from what is not.

Because Soranus regarded the soul as a corporeal and uniform substance with a ἡγεμονικόν as its central organ, it may be assumed as certain that the rejection of the doctrines of Anaxagoras and Aristotle on the νοῦς, and the approbation of the opposite view of

¹) For this chapter, cf. also p. 38*.

²) For a complete list, see Index I.

³) For further particulars, see p. 41*.

⁴) Cf. E. Rohde, Rhein. Mus. 37 (1882), 465/8 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 2, 204/8); E. Bickel, *Diatribes in Senecae philosophi fragmenta*, 1, 119.

⁵) Cf. p. 30*.

⁶) Cf. p. 529.

⁷) This is best shown by the analysis of ch. 9 (pp. 162/3) and of ch. 17 (p. 240).

Democritus in ch. 12¹, derive from him. The same holds good of the greater part of the discussion on the parts of the soul in ch. 14, viz., the lengthy doxographical survey which shows the influence of the Sceptics (cf. p. 30*), the discussion of Aristotle's assertion that the denotation *δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς* should be preferred to *μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς*, a passage in § 5 which certainly derives from Aenesidemus, and a reference to the interest of 'physicians' (i. e., Soranus) in etymology. In the description of the influence of external circumstances on the evolution of individual souls (ch. 20), in which most of the details were taken from other sources, the passage concerning the state of health and diseases (§ 4) must be ascribed to Soranus. Perhaps the same applies to the detailed description of embryotomy in 25, 5². An analysis of ch. 27 shows that Tert. here abandons his usual view on procreation and adopts the opinion of Soranus; hence the basis of the exposition (but no more than that) has been borrowed from the Ephesian. Since puberty was also mentioned in doxographical literature, the first paragraph of ch. 38 (where Asclepiades is quoted) must come from the same source; furthermore, in § 3 Tert. attacks Soranus' view that the soul is directly nourished by corporeal food. From this we may suppose that the refutation of a materialistic conception of the growth of the soul (37, 5/7), a conception which is in perfect accordance with the view contested in ch. 38, was also levelled at him.

In the preface to the discussion on death (ch. 42) Tert. may owe his knowledge of the second *Κύρια δέξια* of Epicurus to Soranus, though this is far from certain (cf. p. 459). In the lengthy chapter on sleep (43) not only the doxographical survey, but also the polemical first part, which is mainly based on data from medical science, and the approbation of the Stoic view show a strong influence of the Ephesian; the same may perhaps be said of some details in the first part of ch. 48, where the influence of external circumstances on dreams is examined³. In the chapters dealing with death the refutation of the view of Democritus on the occurrence of 'portions of the soul' in dead bodies (51, 2)⁴ points the same way. This is less probable with regard to ch. 53, where Tert. (almost certainly combating Lucretius, cf. p. 540) gives a circumstantial description of the soul's slow departure from the body; the words (53, 1) *prius . . . quod est loci huius explebimus, ne, quia varios exitus mortis ediximus, expectet quis a nobis rationes singulorum medicis potius relinquendas, propriis arbitris omnium letalium rerum sive causarum et ipsarum corporalium condicionum*, which induced Karpp to assert that the whole chapter should be ascribed to Soranus, only imply that this author discussed

¹) For all particulars I explicitly refer to the prefaces to the chapters in the commentary; for chapter 10, cf. p. 182.

²) For the possibility that the influence of Soranus should also be assumed in 25, 4, see p. 319.

³) This, however, is far from certain; cf. pp. 45* and 506.

⁴) This is much less probable with regard to the refutation of Plato in the same passage; for this question, cf. p. 41*.

a subject which Tert. desires to pass over here. Besides, I cannot follow Karpp (41₁₇) in finding here an allusion to the 'methodical' doctrine of the πόροι λόγῳ θεωρητοί. Still we may conclude from the passage just quoted that Soranus (who, of course, is meant by *medicis*, cf. p. 208) dealt with the various kinds of death, and hence assume that he also discussed the antithesis *mors naturalis—mors contra naturam* which forms the theme of ch. 52¹. Finally, some points from ch. 2 (cf. pp. 97/8) may perhaps be mentioned.

Up to now I have only discussed passages which either on account of Soranus' name being mentioned or because of their accordance with his views may be regarded as certainly or almost certainly deriving from the treatise Περὶ ψυχῆς. Now I must turn to a number of chapters², for which I would not *a limine* exclude the possibility that they show the influence of Soranus, but for which a different interpretation is nevertheless more likely. These are such chapters as contain a detailed refutation of an opposite view. *A priori* nothing prevents us from ascribing these passages, too, to Soranus: Soranus' propensity to polemic discussions has already been described in the earlier part of this chapter (p. 26*), and even if we knew nothing about this the words *Soranus . . . cum omnibus philosophorum sententiis expertus* in 6, 6, and his being characterized as an *argumentator* in 38, 3 would be plainly sufficient to support this assumption.

However, an example may show that this supposition is apt to create serious errors. In the sixth chapter Tert. discusses and refutes four arguments of the Platonists in favour of the incorporeity of the soul. When discussing the third argument ("Every body is nourished by corporeal substances, but the soul by incorporeal ones, so the soul is not a body"), he mentions, and subscribes to, the view of Soranus that the soul is also nourished by corporeal substances, and hence should be regarded as corporeal itself. From this passage Karpp (p. 32) rightly concludes that, besides the refutation of this thesis, Tert. also found the thesis itself in Περὶ ψυχῆς. After this he goes a step further and supposes (pp. 32/3) that the preceding part of the chapter has been borrowed from the same source. It is quite possible (cf., however, p. 132) that Tert. knew the first argument of the Platonists through the intermediary of Soranus, but this cannot be true of the refutation. A closer examination shows that of the three arguments of which this refutation consists (cf. p. 135), the second is based on a chapter of *De censu animae*, and the first is only made possible by the fact that the syllogism of the Platonists is rendered in a distorted form, which almost certainly was given to it for the purpose of facilitating the refutation; finally, the third argument

¹) It may also be pointed out that the antithesis κατὰ φύσιν—παρὰ φύσιν plays an important part in Soranus' work. As to ch. 53, it is of course possible that Soranus also discussed a slow form of death; but even so the influence of his work in this chapter is not very probable, because here the main theme is the refutation of Lucretius.

²) Of course, the chapters excepted above (p. 33*) are not taken into account here either.

contains an outrageous sophism ("if it is peculiar to a body to be moved by another substance, then it is still more peculiar to it to move other substances itself"). Thus the second argument must be ascribed to Tert. himself, which in itself is sufficient to refute Karpp's supposition; the other two raise the difficult and highly important question whether this perversion of an opposite view and this sophism are the work of Soranus or of Tert. In support of the first possibility one might refer to Soranus' predilection for polemical discussions, and point out that the corporeality of the soul formed the nucleus of his psychology, so that we need not be surprised to find him using inadmissible arguments. However, this supposition is made much less probable by the circumstance that Soranus' usual way of reasoning, as shown by the *Γυναικεῖα*, by Caelius Aurelianus, and by such passages of *De anima* as unquestionably derive from him, is of a totally different character, whereas in Tert.'s works sophisms and distortions are the order of the day. Whoever, after reading contemporary treatises such as *De resurrectione carnis* and *Adversus Praxean*, and especially *De carne Christi*, *De pudicitia*, and *De ieiunio*, comes upon *De anima*, is not at all surprised by arguments of the sort as just described, but feels himself on familiar ground. He who, on the other hand, makes a point of maintaining that here, too, Tert. is following Soranus continuously has to assume a highly improbable *harmonie préétablie* between the ways of reasoning of Soranus and Tert. It might still be pointed out that Soranus, who, as an adherent of the methodical school, maintained close relations with the Sceptics, might also have adopted the Sceptic methods of arguing; but even the arguments of the Sceptics, as we find them in the works of Sextus Empiricus, are quite different from the sophisms and perversions of Tert., which can only be explained by his earlier profession of lawyer. Hence, though I know quite well that in this matter it is impossible to arrive at complete certainty, I think the assumption is justified that such sophistical arguments as are also found in other works of Tert., where an influence of Soranus is out of the question, should be ascribed to Tert. himself. This assumption is supported by the circumstance that such sophisms also occur in *De anima* in chapters where Tert. does not follow Soranus (cf. especially the analysis of ch. 7, pp. 147/8).

I conclude, therefore, that in ch. 6 the refutation of the first argument of the Platonists is of Tert.'s own finding. When we examine next the refutation of the second argument (6, 5, see the analysis, p. 139), we see that it only becomes intelligible through the curious identification of *accidens* and *accedens*, which is peculiar to Tert. When, finally, at the end of the chapter (6, 8/9) we find two reminiscences of Tert.'s juridical knowledge and of his doctrine of the Trinity, we arrive at the conclusion that Karpp is certainly wrong in ascribing the contents of the whole chapter to Soranus.

So I regard the following passages as Tert.'s own contribution: 1) the cavilling beginning of ch. 9 ("the soul either possesses the qualities of other bodies, because it is a body, or it does not possess them,

because it is a body of a very particular nature'''); 2) the second part of ch. 10, where the identity of living and breathing is demonstrated by numerous sophisms; 3) the demonstration of the equivalence of sense-perception and intellectual knowledge in ch. 18; 4) the complicated argument concerning the origin of the irrational element of the soul in ch. 16; 5) the entire discussion in ch. 19. A special difficulty is raised by the very detailed discussion on sense-perception (ch. 17), in which the arguments of the Middle Academy against the reliability of the senses are refuted. According to Karpp (pp. 35/6), Tert. follows Soranus throughout this chapter, but first it is not certain whether Soranus held the same view as Tert., secondly the refutation consists of a curious mixture of Stoic and Epicurean arguments which contradict each other, so that it is fairly probable that this selection was made by Tert. himself¹. The end of the chapter, where Tert. frankly admits that his polemic is due to the wish to defend the doctrine of the Church, also shows that he did not need Soranus to make up his mind concerning this subject.

It is equally improbable that the demonstration of the soul's having a beginning in time (ch. 4), which is entirely based on the treatise *De censu animae*, and the discussion on its sex (ch. 36), which is primarily directed against Apelles the Gnostic, is borrowed from corresponding passages in *Περὶ ψυχῆς*. The same holds good of ch. 13, where the idea of the soul's being superior to the *animus* may also be proved from everyday speech in perfect accordance with Tert.'s high estimation of the *sensus communes*. For the lengthy refutation of the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις, see pp. 304/6.

Next I must turn to a second authority quoted by Tert. I have already observed (p. 34*) that the most recent philosopher quoted in *De anima* is not Posidonius, as was the case in the *Vetusta Placita*, but Arius. In the discussion of the fate of the soul after death (54, 2) the following note is found: *Itaque apud illum* (sc. Platonem) *in aethere sublimantur animae sapientes, apud Arium in aere, apud Stoicos sub lunam*. This of course refers to Arius Didymus of Alexandria (about 70 B.C. — 9/14 A.D.), the court-philosopher of Augustus², who was officially a Stoic but in reality took up an eclectic position and showed a leaning towards the Sceptics³. He composed

¹) Moreover, this refutation contains several commonplace explanations of sense-illusions, which can hardly be ascribed to a serious physician.

²) For his life, cf. Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skeptiz.*, 205, and especially Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 80/8.

³) In the fragments of the Ἐπιτομή the influence of the Sceptics can be perceived, especially in the fragment preserved by Stobaeus *ecl.* 2, 1, 17/8 (6, 18 *segg.* Wachsmuth) which bears the title Διδύμου ἐκ τοῦ περὶ αἰρέσεων and which may have formed part of the preface to the whole work (there is not sufficient reason to follow Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 78) in questioning its authenticity). According to Goedeckemeyer, *op. cit.*, 205, Arius must even be qualified as primarily a Sceptic; in this connection we may point out

a compilation under the title 'Επιτομή¹ in which he gave a survey of the doctrines of the Platonists, the Peripatetics, and the Stoics. It is probable (though not quite certain) that these accounts were divided into three parts, logic, physics, and ethics being treated separately; considerable fragments of them have been preserved by Stobaeus and Eusebius². This work was completely different from the 'Αρέσκοντα of Aëtius: whereas the latter compilation only gives an enumeration of the δόξαι of single philosophers in their most concise form, Arius always gave a coherent description of the doctrines of whole schools, without, as it seems, making a sharp distinction between the views of the founders of these schools and those of their successors³.

Diels (*Dox. gr.*, 86₁) rightly connects the passage from *De anima* just quoted with Arius *frag. phys.* 39, 4/5 (ib. 471, 9/15): Εἶναι δὲ ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ φασίν (sc. οἱ Στωϊκοί), ὃ καλοῦσιν αἰθέρα καὶ ἀέρα κύκλῳ περὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἀναθυμιάσεις· τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς ψυχὰς προσπεφυκέναι ταύτῃ, ὅσαι τε ἐν ζώοις εἰσὶ καὶ ὅσαι ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι· διαμένειν γὰρ ἐκεῖ τὰς τῶν ἀποθανόντων ψυχὰς. ἐνιοὶ δὲ τὴν μὲν τοῦ ὅλου αἰδίον, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς συμμίγνυσθαι ἐπὶ τελευτῇ εἰς ἐκείνην (cf. *ib.* § 2). This would lead us to suppose that the doxographical data occurring in *De anima* derive partly from the 'Επιτομή of Arius, and consequently the question arises whether this compilation was used by Soranus or by Tert. himself⁴. The latter possibility must be regarded as highly improbable, for it would be altogether contrary to Tert.'s usual methods⁵ to consult two works which to a certain degree contained

that the work of Antiochus of Ascalon, who had much influence on Arius, was also used by Sextus Empiricus (cf. *St. V. F.* 2, 63).

¹) Perhaps another title of this work was *Περὶ αἰρέσεων*; cf. Diels, *op. cit.*, 78/9, who also mentions a second possibility, viz., that *Περὶ αἰρέσεων* was the title of the preface only. I cannot possibly subscribe to the view of E. Howald (*Das philosophiegeschichtliche Compendium des Areios Didymos*, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 68/98) who maintains that Arius wrote a comprehensive history of philosophy entitled *Περὶ αἰρέσεων* of which the 'Επιτομή was a 'wretched excerpt' comprising only the schools of philosophers still existing at the time of the author. For the quotations of Clement of Alexandria from *Δίδυμος*, which are the most important argument for Howald's hypothesis, see already Diels, *op. cit.*, 79; cf. also Witt, *Albinus*, 102.

²) For the contents, see Diels, *op. cit.*, 72/3 (it is a question whether a part dealing with logic ever existed; at any rate, no fragment concerning logic is extant now). For the fragments referring to physics, see *ib.*, 447/72; those concerning ethics are found in *Stob. ecl.* 2, 7 (37, 15/152, 25 Wachsm.; ethics of the Stoics and the Peripatetics). Unfortunately no fragments referring to psychology have been preserved.

³) Cf. Diels, *op. cit.*, 78.

⁴) For a third possibility, see p. 44* (only for Plato).

⁵) Thus in *Ad nationes* Tert. uses Varro, *Antiq. div.*, in *De corona* Claudius Saturninus, in *De spectaculis* Suetonius, in *Adversus Marcionem* I Irenaeus, in *Adv. Marc.* II (perhaps) Theophilus (cf. G. Quispel, *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, 22/55). In the second part of the third book Justin is Tert.'s only authority; besides, Irenaeus has been consulted for certain passages (Quispel, *op. cit.*, 56/79), as is also the case in *De anima*, but this method is altogether different from a continuous consultation of two rather similar works.

the same material. Moreover, we may be certain that in this case he would have said something about his thorough study of philosophy when preparing *De anima*, whereas now he only mentions his reading of Soranus 'who took up arms against all existing views of philosophers': these words seem to imply that Tert. regarded his having consulted Περὶ ψυχῆς as quite sufficient.

On the other hand, it is not at all improbable that Soranus made use of the work of Arius. His interest in history and philosophy (cf. pp. 26*/8*) cannot possibly have been satisfied by the concise data furnished by the *Vetusta Placita*, especially with regard to Aristotle and the Stoics (cf. pp. 33*/4*); so it is quite understandable that he should also have consulted a work which gave more detailed information about the three most important philosophical schools, and which, moreover, was congenial to him on account of the author's inclination towards Scepticism.

In comparing the data concerning Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics which are found in *De anima* with the corresponding parts of the Ἀρέσχοινα of Aëtius, Tert.'s information is found to be much more extensive. Of course it may be argued that Aëtius perhaps omitted numerous details from the *Vetusta Placita* which Soranus found there, but first this assumption is far from probable¹, secondly these omissions would frequently bear upon highly important δόξαι the exclusion of which would be difficult to explain, and thirdly *De anima* sometimes differs from Aëtius with regard to the same δόξα. These arguments show that not everything which is not found in Aëtius need have occurred in the *Vetusta Placita*, so that there is room for the supposition that these additions were borrowed by Soranus from Arius². For the Stoics we may refer to the lengthy account of arguments in favour of the corporeality of the soul (ch. 5) and the notes on the corporeality of the τέχναι (6, 7) and the entrance of the soul into the body at the moment of birth (25, 2). As to Aristotle, we may mention 15, 3 (the heart as the central organ), 43, 2 (definition of sleep; the wording differs from that given by Aëtius), and especially the detailed account of his view concerning the mind (ch. 12), which contains a literal translation of several passages from Aristotle's Περὶ ψυχῆς. Such accurate information is far from probable in the case of the *Vetusta Placita*; on the other hand, it is certain that Arius read Aristotle in the original and frequently quoted passages from his works³.

¹) The possibility that Aëtius should have excluded data from the *Vetusta Placita* is not even mentioned by Diels, *Dox. Gr.*

²) Of course, this is no more than a supposition; it is quite possible that Soranus (but probably not Tert.) used other sources as well.

³) This is not the case in the extant fragments of the 'ethical' part of the Ἐπιτομή, but in the fragments concerning physics (of which the chapter Περὶ ψυχῆς must have been a part) the *Meteorologica* are continuously drawn upon (cf. Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 72). As to the *Vetusta Placita*, cf. Diels, *op. cit.*, 217: "Vetustorum igitur Placitorum explicatori hand dubito quin ea Aristotelis decreta adscribenda sint, quae non ex accurata ipsius doctrina, sed ex recentiorum Peripateticorum schola recepta videantur, quod genus Arius fere (this, of course, refers to the ethical fragments only) et Cicero adhibere solent".

However, by far the largest number of quotations is found in the passages concerning Plato. Let us first enumerate them. Translations (or at least passages clearly showing that the original text was examined) are found in: 1) 17, 12 (Socrates' comments on the proverb γνῶθι σαυτόν: *Phaedr.* 229 E); 2) 18, 1/2 (unreliability of knowledge obtained through the body: *Phaedo* 65 A/B and 65 E/66 A; a lengthy, very accurate translation); 3) 23, 5 (the creation of souls; *Tim.* 69 C); 23, 6 (the migration of souls from one world to another: *Phaedo* 70 C); 28, 1 (a literal translation from *Phaedo* 70 C); 54, 4 (Hades: *Phaedo* 109 B/C and 111 E/112 A). References to passages from Plato occur in: 1) 4 (the soul ἀγέννητος: *Phaedrus* 246 A; the ποιητής also ἀπατήρ: *Tim.* 28 C); 2) 9, 2 (the soul without a definite shape: probably a confusion of *Phaedo* 78 B/C and *Phaedr.* 247 C); 3) 10, 1 (the soul μονοειδής: *Phaedo* 80 B); 4) 17, 2 (sense-perception unreliable according to the *Timaeus*: 51 A *seqq.*, cf. also 28 C); 5) 17, 12¹ (the impossibility of knowledge: *Theaetet.* 150 C; truth unattainable in this life: *Phaedr.* 247 D/E); 6) 18, 12 (*Tim.* 29 B); 7) 20, 3 (why Athene chose Attica for the foundation of a city: *Tim.* 24 C; a similar statement from *Leg.* 704 B *seqq.*); 8) 23, 6 (μαθήσεις ἀναμνήσεις: *Phaedo* 72 E); 9) 24 (the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις; cf. also 24, 3: Plato on the value of memory); 10) 25, 2 (two different views about the entrance of the soul into the body; probably *Tim.* 91 A/D and *Phaedo* 81 E or *Phaedr.* 246 C); 11) 25, 9 conception dangerous in case of inebriety, etc.: *Leg.* 775 B/C); 12) 43, 11 (*Tim.* 29 B); 13) 48, 2 (the function of the liver with regard to dreams: *Tim.* 70 D/72 D); 14) 51, 2 (the story of Er: *Rep.* X, 614 B)²; 15) 54, 2 (the fate of the souls of philosophers after death: *Phaedr.* 249 A). Finally, we may mention the four arguments of the *Platonici* in favour of the incorporeity of the soul (ch. 6), and a possible quotation from the *Philebus* in ch. 12; cf. also the preface to ch. 28 and the comm. on 5, 1.

It is, however, highly improbable that all these quotations and references (which certainly were not found in the *Vetusta Placita*) derive from the Ἐπιτομή of Arius, as Tert. twice (28, 1; 29, 4) quotes a famous authority on Platonism, viz., Albinus. In order to understand the import of these quotations, it is necessary first to examine the lengthy refutation of metempsychosis (ch. 28/35), which has not yet been discussed in this chapter.

We may begin with excepting ch. 34 and 35, which only give paraphrases of passages from Irenaeus (cf. p. 46*). As for the six remaining chapters (for their contents, see p. 18*), so much at least is clear that here Tert. has worked up his material in his usual way. Thus ch. 33, in which the view of metempsychosis as a retribution after death is discussed, is primarily based on Tert.'s juridical knowledge, and in ch. 30 Plato's view that the total number of existing souls must be constant, is connected with the *primordii contemplatio* which in *De anima* plays such a prominent part (cf. p. 176); of the four arguments

¹) For chapter 16, see p. 44*, note 3.

²) For this passage, cf. also p. 529.

against metempsychosis which are found in ch. 31, the first (for which see p. 378) is certainly of Tert.'s own finding, in ch. 29 Plato's sentence ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων is once more associated with the situation described in Genesis, and finally, the refutation of Empedocles in ch. 32 is partly founded on data borrowed from Pliny. Nevertheless Tert. must have found the most important particulars of the doctrine of metempsychosis (ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων, invariability in the total number of souls, interim of a thousand years, metempsychosis as a retribution in the beyond) in a source which gave a fairly complete survey of this subject¹.

It is in this context that Tert. twice mentions Albinus, first as supporting the view that the παλαιὸς λόγος mentioned in *Phaedo* 70 C "may have come from a god, perhaps from the Egyptian Mercury"², next as the author of an attempt to defend the sentence ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων "by a subtle classification of the different kinds of contrasts". Especially on account of the latter passage it is as good as certain that Tert. became acquainted with the points just mentioned through the intermediary of Albinus; this supposition may also be supported by the circumstance that in the same part of *De anima* (33, 2) *Mercurius Aegyptius* is once more quoted³. It is impossible that these particulars were borrowed from the still extant Διδασκαλικὸς τῶν Πλάτωνος δογμάτων⁴, because in this work the παλαιὸς λόγος is not even mentioned⁵, and the classification of contrasts is only alluded to (ch. 25 = 177, 30 *seqq.* Hermann) in a fairly obscure sentence which cannot have given rise to Tert.'s refutation; hence the more extensive work, which, according to Freudenthal⁶, had the title Περὶ τῶν Πλάτωνι ἀρεσκόντων, must have been the source.

According to Karpp (30, 3) and Diels⁷, it is quite possible that

¹) In an earlier attack directed against metempsychosis (*apol.* 48, 1/8) these facts are not yet taken into account.

²) However, cf. the next note.

³) Still, it is also possible that Albinus only qualified the *vetus sermo* as *divinus*, and that the words *Mercurii forsitan Aegyptii* (28, 1) are an addition by Tert.; if this is true, the argument of course becomes invalid.

⁴) Probably the title was Ἐπιτομή τῶν Πλάτωνος δογμάτων (thus the best manuscripts: *Paris.* 1962 and *Vindob. phil. graec.* 314); cf. Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 761; Überweg-Prächter, 526.

⁵) The παλαιὸς λόγος mentioned in ch. 28 (181, 31 Hermann) has nothing to do with *Phaedo* 70 C.

⁶) *Hellenistische Studien*, 3, 244 and 302; cf. also Diels-Schubart, *Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetetus* (Berliner Klassikertexte, Heft 2, 1905), preface, XXVIII. According to Diels, the Διδασκαλικός was an abbreviated edition of the third book of the more extensive monograph. There is also a slight possibility that Tert. consulted commentaries on Plato (*Phaedo*, *Timaeus*) by Albinus (cf. Diels, *op. cit.*, XXIX/XXX); this supposition would receive strong support from the anonymous commentary on the *Theaetetus*, p. 48, 7/11 (περὶ δὲ τούτου τοῦ δόγματος (viz., τῆς ἀναμνήσεως) ῥηθήσεται ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς ὑπομνήμασι), if it were certain that this commentary was indeed written by Albinus. However, Freudenthal has shown that quotations usually ascribed to these commentaries are also found in the Διδασκαλικός.

⁷) Diels, too, supposes (*Anon. Komm. zu Plat. Theaet.*, XXVII) that Soranus (who lived at Ephesus) was acquainted with the work of Albinus (who lived at Smyrna).

this longer work was consulted by Soranus. However, this view is far from probable on chronological grounds. Soranus composed his works during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian; as for Albinus, we know at least that Galen, who in 144 attended a course by a distinguished pupil of Gaius, the teacher of Albinus, at Pergamum, in 151/2 went to Smyrna to meet the latter ¹. So, if we subscribe to Karpp's view, we have to suppose that Soranus used a work by a much younger contemporary, who, as may perhaps be deduced from the facts just mentioned, had not yet attained fame in 144 ². In addition to this serious objection it should be pointed out that, whereas in the case of Soranus, who never shows any particular interest in Plato, no special reason can be found why he should have consulted the monograph by Albinus besides his other sources ³, Tert. was particularly interested in Plato, whom he regarded as the spiritual father of all heresies, and above all in the doctrine of metempsychosis, which in his eyes was extremely dangerous to the doctrine of the Church. In 23, 5 he argues that all gnostic theories about a celestial origin of the soul derive from Plato, the *condimentarius haereticorum*, who in the *Phaedo* (70 C) asserted that all souls 'are moving from one world into another', and in support of this view 'invented a new argument' (23, 6), viz., that learning is nothing but remembering; this thesis is confuted in ch. 24. In ch. 28 Tert. returns to the same passage from the *Phaedo*, which forms the introduction to his refutation of metempsychosis. It is only at the end that the motives for this refutation become clear: this doctrine of Plato endangers the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh (33, 10); besides, it is adhered to by Simon Magus and Corpocrates (34/5). Albinus being twice mentioned in this part, I cannot but conclude that Tert. in ch. 23, 5/6, 24, and 28/33 has used the work of Albinus.

To this another consideration may be added. In the refutation of the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις Tert. writes (24, 10): *Multa item documenta teste ipso Platone divinationem animae probaverunt, quae proposuimus iam Hermogeni*. These words clearly show that already in *De censu animae* (cf. p. 304) Tert. quoted Plato and advanced 'many Platonic arguments' in proof of the soul's faculty of divination. These arguments he must have borrowed from an authority which gave a detailed account of the doctrine of Plato; the most plausible supposition is

¹) Cf. Witt, *Albinus*, 107; Diels, *Anon. Komm. zu Plat. Theaet.*, XXVI/XXVII.

²) Moreover, it is not very probable that Albinus was already regarded as an important authority on Platonic philosophy, while Gaius was still living.

³) Arius' Ἐπιτομή was one of the authorities drawn upon by Albinus for his Διδασκαλικός, and hence probably also for his work περὶ τῶν Πλάτωνι ἀρεσκόντων (Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, 3, 297; Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 76 and 447; *Anon. Komm. zu Pl. Theaet.*, XXXI/XXXV; H. Strache, *De Arii Didymi in morali philosophia auctoribus* (Berlin 1907); Witt, *Albinus*, 77/8; 102/3). Since, however, the works of Albinus — the pupil of Gaius! — certainly contained many more data concerning Platonic philosophy than the survey given by Arius, the circumstance that Albinus also drew upon Arius cannot be adduced in proof of a supposition that, after reading Arius, Soranus felt no need to consult Albinus' works as well.

that this source, too, was the work of Albinus. Now *De Censu Animae* was written after *Adversus Hermogenem* and before *Adversus Marcionem* II, i. e., between 205 and 207 (cf. p. 5*); since, moreover, the most probable assumption is that Tert. only consulted the work of Soranus when he had started preparing the composition of *De anima*¹, which cannot have taken place before 210, we arrive at the conclusion that Tert. was probably acquainted with the work of Albinus before he started reading the treatise by Soranus. It would be quite understandable that for the treatment of a subject on which Plato was his chief adversary, he should once more turn to a book which on an earlier occasion he had found useful.

If this supposition is right², the question arises whether the influence of Albinus can be ascertained in more passages, or even in all the places just mentioned which refer to the doctrine of Plato. At any rate, the *Διδασκαλικός* contains several details which are also found in *De anima*: ch. 25 (178, 15 H.) — Tert. ch. 4 (the soul ἀγέννητος); ch. 23/4 — 16, 1 (the ἄλογον of the soul)³; ch. 25 (178, 26/9 H.) — 25, 2 (the entrance of the soul into the body at birth); ch. 23 (176, 22/6 H.) — 48, 2 (the function of the liver with regard to dreams). So it may be supposed that the more extensive work of Albinus contained many more particulars which are also mentioned by Tert. However, this question is impossible of final solution, because the doxographical matter in *De anima* derives partly from Arius' Ἐπιτομή, and because Albinus also used this work⁴. An exception can be made only for such data as were certainly borrowed from Soranus⁵, viz., the arguments of the Platonists mentioned in ch. 6 (perhaps also the particulars found in 25, 2; 25, 9; 54, 2/3)⁶.

§ 4. Other authorities.

Whereas the treatise by Soranus was used throughout *De anima*, other authors were only consulted by Tert. for certain parts of his work. Among these, the most important is Hermippus of Berytus. In order to understand the use made of his work, we must first examine the chapters devoted to dreams (45/9). In ch. 45, which opens the discussion, Tert. gives a definition of dreams which is

¹) This is also borne out by Tert.'s words in 2, 6: *sed et medicinam inspexit*, which clearly show that he read Soranus' *Περὶ ψυχῆς* for the express purpose of composing a monograph on the soul.

²) I know that all this is purely hypothetical; however, this circumstance does not release me from the obligation to point out the most likely possibility.

³) Still, it should be remembered that the doxographical matter found in ch. 16 does not contain more facts than the note concerning Plato in 14, 2, in which passage Tert. certainly drew upon Soranus.

⁴) Cf. p. 43*, note 3.

⁵) Who almost certainly did not consult the monograph by Albinus, as has just been discussed.

⁶) Besides, it is not altogether impossible that Tert. should have read the *Phaedo* (ἡ περὶ ψυχῆς), and perhaps the *Timaeus* as well, in the original (for the reading of Plato in the second century of our era, cf. Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 93/4).

based on the Montanistic doctrine of ecstasy, and so has no further importance for the investigation of the sources. On the other hand, ch. 46 contains much material in proof of the value of dreams as announcements of the future. First the relevant views of Epicurus and Aristotle are referred to (§§ 2/3), then fourteen examples of famous prophetic dreams are quoted (§§ 4/9), and finally a list is given of dream-interpreters and dream-oracles (§§ 10/1). At the end of this enumeration Tert. writes: *Cetera (sc. oracula) cum suis et originibus et ritibus et relatoribus, cum omni deinceps historia somniorum, Hermippus Berytensis quinione voluminum satiatissime exhibebit*. From this sentence the conclusion may be unreservedly drawn that all the material concerning dreams which is found in chapters 45/9 derives from the dream-book of Hermippus: the words *cum omni... historia somniorum* do not admit of any other interpretation. This inference is strongly supported by the circumstance that Tert. uses a superlative here (*satiatissime*), for in two other passages in his works he also employs this form to denote his chief authority, viz., *cor. 7, 46/7: Plura quaerentibus omnia exhibebit praestantissimus in hac quoque materia commentator Claudius Saturninus*; *adv. Val. 5 (182, 7 seqq.): materias, quas tot iam viri sanctitate et praestantia insignes, nec solum nostri antecessores, sed ipsorum haeresiarcharum contemporales, instructissimis voluminibus et prodiderunt et retulerunt, ut Iustinus, philosophus et martyr, ut Miltiades, ecclesiarum sophista, ut Irenaeus, omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator* (the treatise *Adversus Valentinianos* is no more than an ingenious paraphrase of the text of Irenaeus; cf. pp. 403/5). So the points discussed in ch. 47/9 (classification of prophetic dreams, influence of external circumstances on the quality of dreams, theories that certain classes of man never dream) may all be traced back to this work (various parallels from the dream-book of Artemidorus may be found in the commentary). Since, moreover, Hermippus may have used a collection of θαύμασια (see the note on 46, 10: *Aristoteles, ignosce ridenti*, p. 496) and the data discussed in ch. 44 for the greater part also derive from such a collection¹, we may perhaps conclude that for this chapter, too, Tert. took his materials from Hermippus².

Next to this author we must mention Irenaeus, Tert.'s chief authority in *Adversus Valentinianos* and in *Adversus Marcionem I*. In *De anima* the following passages show his influence: 1) ch. 7 (demonstration of the corporeality of the soul from the story of Lazarus: *Iren. 2, 55*); 2) 11, 3 (the distinction between *flatus* and *spiritus*: *Iren. 5, 12, 2*); 3) 37, 4 (the symbolic interpretation of the *hebdomas*: *Iren. 5, 30, 4*); 4) ch. 55 (the discussion on Christ's descent into Hell: *Iren. 5, 31, 2*). To these passages must be added all the accounts

¹) At any rate, all these data refer to dreams (Hermetismus, Epimenides, Thrasymedes): cf. p. 475. But it is also possible that Tert. should have read such a 'miracle-book' himself.

²) To these chapters we must add 57, 10 (cf. comm. *ad loc.*).

of heretical doctrines with one exception¹, in the first place the detailed descriptions of the systems of Simon and Carpocrates, which are no more than paraphrases of the text of Irenaeus (Tert. 34/5, Iren. 1, 16, 1/2 and 1, 20, 2; also Tert. 23, 2, Iren. 1, 20, 1), and further the shorter notes on Saturninus (T. 23, 1, Iren. 1, 18, 1), Menander (T. 50, 2, Iren. 1, 17), and the Valentinians (T. 11, 3; 21; 23, 4; Iren. 1, 1, 10/1; T. 18, 3 (influence of Plato on the Valentinians), Iren. 2, 18, 3).

A Christian authority must also have been used in ch. 26, where scriptural passages are quoted in proof of the assertion that the embryo is an animate being (cf. p. 336); probably the same holds good of 37, 1 (the embryo guarded by angels)².

Of Roman authors Pliny is quoted most frequently. In the first place we may mention all data concerning animals (8, 4: visual power of eagles and owls; 10, 2/5: the question whether insects breathe; 24, 5: the *naturalia* of the lion; several data from 32, 3; 32, 6: the harmlessness of hellebore for goats and quails). To these must be added the notes on precious stones (9, 6), on the birth of Scipio (25, 8; perhaps also the note concerning Bacchus), on the luxury of Apicius, etc. (33, 4; probably copied from *De pallio*), on *aquarum generum miranda* (50, 3), and on the death of Chilon and Crassus (52, 3).

Of Lucretius a verse (1, 305) is quoted in 5, 6. His influence is unquestionable in the discussions on the weeping of new-born children (19, 7/8) and on the question how the soul leaves the body at death (53, 3/4). Perhaps some details in the chapters on sense-perception (ch. 17, cf. p. 246) and on the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις (ch. 24, cf. p. 306) also derive from him; cf. the note on 37, 5.

Varro has been used in three places. From the *Antiquitates divinae* (the chief source of *Ad nationes*) Tert. took the lists of pagan gods given in 37, 1 and 39, 2; the digression on migrations of nations (30, 2), just as a very similar passage in *De pallio* (2, 6), was borrowed from the *Antiquitates humanae* (which are also mentioned, though without the name of the author). For a possible imitation of the *Satira Menippea* (which, however, is far from certain), see the note on 32, 2 (p. 385); cf. also 55, 4. Of any influence of Cicero few traces can be discovered. As completely certain I regard only the use of a passage from *De fato* in ch. 20 (see p. 283); besides, a reminiscence of the *Academica* may perhaps be found in the discussion on sense-perception (17, 11); cf. also comm. on 19, 4/5. On the other hand, I can no longer believe³ that Tert. consulted *De divinatione*; the parallels quoted by Norden (Komm. Verg. *Aen.* VI, 41 seqq.) refer without exception to facts which were generally known, and which Tert. may have found in the dream-book of Hermippus.

Seneca is quoted twice (20, 1: *de benef.* 4, 6, 6; 42, 2: *Troad.* 397; see the note, p. 460). Perhaps the influence of *De remed. fort.* is

¹) viz., the note concerning Apelles in 23, 3.

²) On the other hand, I have not found any traces of the influence of Justin and Athenagoras; for Tatianus and Melito, cf. Index III, s. vv.; for a possible influence of Philo, see the end of ch. III (p. 14*).

³) as I did in my dissertation, p. 11.

to be assumed in ch. 50; cf. also the note on 56, 2 (p. 568).

Suetonius, Tert.'s chief authority in *De spectaculis*, is adduced in ch. 44, Sallust in ch. 20 (see pp. 479 and 285).

Hermetic writings are mentioned in three places (15, 5; 28, 1; 33, 2; in 2, 3 Tert. only alludes to 28, 1). Of these notes two (28, 1 and 33, 2), and hence perhaps the third as well, may derive from Albinus, though it is also possible that they are the fruit of Tert.'s own reading (see p. 221)¹; cf. also comm. on 43, 7.

Finally, we must discuss a sentence from 2, 3: (quia plerosque auctores etiam deos existimavit antiquitas), *ut Silenum Phrygem, cui a pastoribus perducto ingentes aures suas Midas tradidit*. The same note is found in two other places, viz., *pall.* 2, 1 and *adv. Hermog.* 25 (154, 3/5); the latter passage contains the addition *auctore Theopompo*. Ultimately this story derives from the eighth book of the *Φιλιππικά* of Theopompus, which contained a collection of miraculous stories and had the special title *Θαυμάσια* or *Περὶ θαυμασίων* (cf. R. Laqueur, *R. E.* II: 5, 2212; the fragments are found in Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 2 B (Berlin 1927), frag. 64/76, pp. 547/52). In later times collections of this kind were very popular, as is shown by the fact that various specimens are still extant, viz., the *Ἱστορίων παραδόξων συναγωγή* by a certain Antigonos, the *Ἱστορίαι θαυμάσιαι* by Apollonius, the treatise *Περὶ θαυμασίων* by Phlegon of Tralles, and the so-called *Paradoxographus Vaticanus Rohdii*². Besides Theopompus, the chief sources of these compilations are the biological treatises of Aristotle and Theophrastus. An important link in the tradition was the work of Bolus of Mendes (see my article 'Bolos', *RAC* I, 1183/9).

It is probable that the passage just mentioned was borrowed by Tert. from a specimen of this kind of literature, which may also hold good of the notes on Pherecydes in 2, 3 and 28, 5 (see the comm.), and two notes in ch. 52. Perhaps three points worked up in ch. 44 (Hermotimus, Epimenides, Thrasymedes), two of which also derive from Theopompus (cf. p. 475), and a note from Aristotle in 46, 10, are from the same source; however, it is quite possible that in this case Hermippus was the intermediary (see p. 475).

¹) It is no longer possible to date the greater part of the *Corpus Hermeticum* as late as the third century after Christ; cf. e. g., Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 132, and 137. It is certain that Athenagoras was acquainted with this collection (Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 178).

²) An edition of these four collections was given by O. Keller, *Rerum naturalium scriptores Graeci minores* (Lipsiae 1877).

CHAPTER VI

THE INFLUENCE OF *DE ANIMA* ON LATER AUTHORS

For obvious reasons the influence of the present treatise in the succeeding centuries was extremely slight¹. In the first place, *De anima* does not contain a well-thought-out system of psychology, but a series of theses which are primarily due to polemical intentions, so that the interest aroused by this work was largely dependent on the currency of the theories combated by Tert.; when the heresies of Valentinus, Marcion, and Carpocrates, and the doctrine of metempsychosis were no longer of primary importance, a considerable part of *De anima* had lost its significance as well. Moreover, the chief thesis, viz., the corporeality of the soul, which was partly based on arguments borrowed from a pagan physician, must soon have repelled Christian readers; the same applies to the materialistic doctrine of traducianism. Finally, it should be pointed out that Tert., who was well read in Greek and in this work drew upon Greek authorities in the first place, discussed various subjects (e. g. metempsychosis) which were never of particular interest to the western part of the Empire; if *De anima* had found readers in the East it would certainly have aroused much wider interest.

On account of these considerations it is not surprising that in the works of Novatianus, Arnobius, Lactantius, Ambrose and Hilary, which on this point too I have perused more than once, not a single trace of an influence of *De anima* can be found. More curious is the fact that in this field even Cyprian did not regard Tert. as his *magister*.

On the other hand, Jerome knew *De anima* as well as Tert.'s other works; however, he only borrowed from it detached sentences and expressions admired by him for their felicitous phrasing. The same applies to the much less numerous imitations found in the works of Fulgentius, in the *Tractatus de Scriptura Sacra* wrongly attributed to Origen, and in the so-called *Epistula de castitate*²; for Prudentius, see the comm. on 24, 2 and the preface to ch. 47 (p. 501).

The only author who was really influenced by Tert.'s psychological theses is Vincentius Victor, who was refuted by Augustine in the treatise *De anima et eius origine*. His description of the shape of the corporeal soul was clearly copied from ch. 9 (see the note on 9, 7, pp. 176/7); moreover, he adopted the passage concerning the function of the body as the abode of the soul (38, 6; cf. also comm. on 36, 4 and 37, 5).

Augustine, too, must have been well acquainted with the contents

¹) For the influence of Tert.'s works in later times, see Harnack, Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1895, 545/79, and especially d'Alès, *Théol. de Tert.*, 499/503; for Tert.'s influence on Novatianus, cf. also Teuffel, *Röm. Lit.*, § 382, 7.

²) For all relevant passages, see Index III.

of *De anima*, as is shown by his quotations from 9, 8 and 37, 5/7 in *De gen. ad litt.* 10, 25, 40 *seqq* (see pp. 178 and 430/1).

It is not clear whether numerous passages in which Tert. is represented or combated as the chief adherent of traducianism, refer to *De anima* (19, 6; 27, 8); the nature of the quotations rather suggests that the points mentioned in these passages derive from the 'doxography' of heresies¹.

Finally, we must mention Fulgentius Planciades, who in three places imitates sentences from *De anima*; in this connection it may be pointed out that he also quotes a sentence from the lost treatise *De fato* (see the note on 20, 5). As to Cassiodorus, I can no longer hold the view that his short monograph *De anima* shows the influence of the present work; the parallels quoted in my dissertation (16/7) are either unimportant or refer to common views.

¹) Already Rufin. *ap. Hier. adv. Rufin.* 2, 8: *Legi quosdam dicentes, quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam animae diffundantur: et haec quibus poterant assertionibus confirmabant. Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis et nonnullos alios; cf. Praedestin. haeres. 26: Obiciunt quidam Tertulliano, quod unimam ex traduce, id est animam dixerit ita gigni ex anima, sicut ex corporibus corpus (cf. also *ib.*, 60); Julian. *ap. Aug. op. imperf. contra Julian.* 2, 178; in Aug.'s refutation of Pelagius concerning this subject (*de peccat. merit. et remiss.* 3, 10, 18) the name of Tert. is not even mentioned. The account of Tert.'s doctrine in Aug. *haeres.* 86 only refers to Montanism and to the theory of the corporeality of the soul (and of God).*

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

INDEX SIGLORUM

- A* Codex Agobardinus (Parisinus Latinus 1622) saec. IX, fol. 118v—166r.
- B* ed. Martini Mesnart (Paris. 1545), vulgo Gagneiana, pp. 247v—265v.
- Bmg* margo editionis Mesnartianae.
- Gel* ed. Sigismundi Gelenii (Basileae 1550), qui usus est codice Masburensi nunc deperdito, pp. 639/89.
- Pam.* ed. Iacobi Pamelii (Antverpiae 1579), pp. 564/602 (adnot.: pp. 602/647).
- La Cerda* ed. Ludovici La Cerda, II (Paris. 1630), pp. 222/434 (adnotationes singulis capitibus adiectae sunt).
- Rig.* ed. Nicolai Rigaltii (Lutetiae 1684), pp. 304/57 (adnot.: pp. 80/8).
- Rig.₂* Rigaltiana altera (ib. 1641), pp. 304/357 (adnot.: pp. 84/93).
- Rig.₃* Rigaltiana tertia (ib. 1675), pp. 264/307.
- Seml.* ed. J. S. Semleri, IV (Halaë Magdeburgicae 1771), pp. 209/336.
- Leop.* ed. E. F. Leopoldii (Bibl. Patr. Eccles. Latin. selecta, cur. E. G. Gersdorf, vol. IV/VII), pars IV (Lipsiae 1841), pp. 169/247.
- Oehl.* ed. Fr. Oehler, II (Lipsiae 1854), pp. 553/650 (ed. minor (Lipsiae 1854), pp. 1000/1077).
- Lindn.* ed. W. B. Lindneri (Lipsiae 1861).
- Rfd.* ed. Aug. Reifferscheidii (Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin., vol. XX, Vindobonae 1890), pp. 298/396.
- Iun.* notae Francisci Iunii editioni Pamelianae iteratae (Francerae 1597) additae, pp. 181/206.
- Lat.* Latini Latini Bibliotheca Sacra et Profana, a Dominico Macro Melitensi nunc primum e Bibliotheca Brancaccia in lucem edita (Romae 1677), p. 199.
- Priorius* notae Ph. Priorii, Rigaltianae tertiae adiectae (pp. 264/307).
- Scal.* notae Josephi Justi Scaligeri manu adscriptae exemplari editionis 'Junianae' quod in bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batavae adservatur.
- Urs.* Fulvii Ursini lectiones, adservatae a Ioa. a Wouwer, Ad Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani opera emendationes epidicticae (Francofurti 1603), pp. 76/91.
- Hartel ap. Rfd* coniecturae Guilelmi Hartelii, in adnotatione critica editionis Reifferscheidianae memoratae.
- Gomperz, Hartel P. St. IV, Kroym., Thörn., v. d. Vliet:* vide pp. 601/2.

Qu. SEPTIMI FLORENTIS TERTULLIANI

DE ANIMA

1. 1. De solo censu animae congressus Hermogeni, quatenus et istum ex materiae potius suggestu quam ex dei flatu constituisse praesumpsit, nunc ad reliquas conversus quaestiones plurimum videbor cum philosophis dimicaturus. 2. Etiam in carcere Socratis de animae statu velitatum est, nescio iam hoc primum, an oportuno in tempore 5 magistri, etsi nihil de loco interest. Quid enim liquido saperet anima tunc Socratis, iam sacro navigio regresso, iam cicutis damnationis exhaustis, iam morte praesente utique consternata ad aliquem motum secundum naturam, aut exsternata, si non secundum naturam? Quamvis enim placida atque tranquilla, quam nec coniugis fletus 10 statim viduae nec liberorum conspectus exinde pupillorum lege pietatis inflexerat, vel in hoc tamen mota, ne moveretur, ipsa constantia concussa est adversus inconstantiae concussionem. Quid autem aliud

In A principium libri deest usque ad 'aut micas' (pag. 8,16).

Q. SEPTIMI FLORENTIS TERTULLIANI CARTHAGINENSIS DE ANIMA LIBER. DE IMMORTALITATE ANIMAE. Si substantia animae, et an corporalis, et an effigiata, unum esse animam et spiritum, non separari animam et animum, an sit, ubi sit quod dicitur hegemonicon, de quinque sensibus corporalibus, quod philosophi et haeretici distinguunt inter sensuality et intellectualia, Intellectum semper animae inesse, De caeteris naturalibus animae, Unde anima adversus haereticos qui eam de coelis deferunt: Adversus argumentum Platonis, quod discentias reminiscencias dicat: De contemptu animae adversus eos qui post partum corpori eam inducunt: Adversus Platonicum dogma, quod non ex mortuis fiant vivi: Ad Pythagorae et Empedoclis opiniones de metempsychosi et metensomatismo: Adversus Simonis opinionem et Carpocratis haereticorum: De sexu animae et carnis, quod simul in utero formentur, in eum: De aetate carnis et animae: De cibis, quomodo ad animam pertinere videantur: Nullam pene animam sine daemonio esse: Quomodo caro peccatrix dicatur: De bono et malo animae: De morte: De somno pertinente ad tractatum mortis: Et de anima Hermotimi: De Hermotimo: De somniis, quomodo ea patiatur anima, et unde eveniant: De vi mortis, et de Menandro haeretico: Nihil animae in corpore manere post mortem, ut videtur quibusdam: De animae excessu, De receptu, De inferis, et an illuc omnes animae compellentur: An commorentur hic animae post mortem, vel ab inferis commeent, An aliquid interim animae patiantur apud inferos, B.

3. plurimum] et plurimum *Gel* (quem refutat *Pam* in adnot.) 4. Socrati *Scal* 5. velitatum] vel ita velificatum *B* est, nescio *Lindn.* *Blf Museum* 41 (1934), 312] est: nescio reliqui 6. magistri] magisterii *Scal* Magistri (vocat.) *Rig.* in annot.; delet *Kroym.* 101 7. Socratis] magistri *Kroym.* 101 susp. 8. motum *Lat Iun*] modum *B Gel*; *Kroym.* 101 totam sententiam inde a voce utique hoc modo immutat: utique ad aliquem modum, si non ad extremum secundum naturam, consternata 9. exsternata *Rig*] externum *B Gel* naturam] consternata *B* 13. est del. *Kroym.* 101

saperet vir quilibet iniuria damnatus praeter iniuriae solamen, nedum philosophus, gloriae animal, cui nec consolanda est iniuria, sed potius insultanda? 3. Denique post sententiam obviae coniugi et muliebriter inclamanti: iniuste damnatus es, Socrates! iam et de gratulatione
 5 responderat: volebas autem iuste? Quo nihil mirandum, si et in carcere inviscatas Anyti et Meliti palmas gestiens infringere ipsa coram immortalitatem vindicans animae necessaria praesumptione ad iniuriae frustrationem. 4. Adeo omnis illa tunc sapientia Socratis de industria venerat consultae aequanimitatis, non de fiducia compertae
 10 veritatis. Cui enim veritas comperta sine deo? Cui deus cognitus sine Christo? Cui Christus exploratus sine spiritu sancto? Cui spiritus sanctus accommodatus sine fidei sacramento? Sane Socrates facilius diverso spiritu agebatur, siquidem aiunt daemionium illi a puero adhaesisse, pessimum revera paedagogum, etsi post deos et cum deis daemonia
 15 deputantur penes poetas et philosophos. 5. Nondum enim Christianae potestatis documenta processerant, quae vim istam perniciosissimam nec unquam bonam, atquin omnis erroris artificem, omnis veritatis advocatricem sola traducit. Quodsi idcirco sapientissimus Socrates secundum Pythii quoque daemonis suffragium scilicet negotium
 20 navantis socio suo, quanto dignior atque constantior Christianae sapientiae adsertio, cuius adflatui tota vis daemonum cedit? 6. Haec sapientia de schola caeli deos quidem saeculi negare liberior, quae nullum Aesculapio gallinaceum reddi iubens praevaricaretur, nec nova inferens daemonia, sed vetera depellens, nec adolescentiam vitians,
 25 sed omni bono pudoris informans, ideoque non unius urbis, sed universi orbis iniquam sententiam sustinens pro nomine veritatis tanto scilicet et perosioris quanto plenioris, ut et mortem non de poculo per habitum iocunditatis absorbeat, sed de patibulo et vivi-comburio per omne ingenium crudelitatis exhaustiat, interea in isto
 30 tenebrosiore carcere saeculi inter suos Cebetas et suos Phaedonas, si quid de anima examinandum est, ad dei regulas diriget, certa nullum alium potiorum animae demonstratorem quam auctorem. A deo discat quod a deo habeat, aut nec ab alio, si nec a deo. Quis enim

2. est *del. Rig* 4. est, Socrates *B Pam 1597* de gratulatione] de Socratica ratione *Rfd susp.* de grata simulatione *Hartel ap. Rfd (Patr. Stud. 4,48 lectionem traditam vindicans)* ut de gratulatione *Gomperz 61*
 5. Quo *del. Gel* 6. inviscatas *Gel; Casp. Scioppius (sec. Oehl)]* in te inviscatas *Blemniscatus Lat lemniscatas vel minic(u)latas Iun* et inter vincula inviscatas *Hartel ap. Rfd* interim inviscatas *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,48* impiscatas *Bickel B Ph W 52 (1932), 961* gestiens *B mg]* gestio *B* gestit *Rfd*
 7. immortalitatem vindicans animae *Gel]* immortaltem vindicans animam *B* immortalitatem vindicat animae *Lat* immortalem vindicans animam *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,49* 17. atquin omnis *Oehl]* atqui hominis *B* antiqui hominis *Gel* antiqui *Lat* homini (vel hominibus), antiqui *Iun*
 20. constantior Christianae *Urs]* constantiae Christianae atque *B Gel*
 21. caedit *Pam (corrigit Iun)* 23. galliceum *B* 27. et om. *Gel* perosioris] alii operosioris' *Iun* 29. post exhaustiat punctum ponit *Lindn* istos tenebrosiores carceres *B* 31. examine examinandum *B* diriget, certa *Hartel ap. Rfd]* diriget. Certe *B Gel* dirigit. Certe *Pam* diriget. Cedo (vel Crede) *Lindn* 32. demonstras demonstratorem *Oehl* demonstratorem habemus *Rfd* auctorem reperiet *Urs* 33. discas *Oehl* habeat *Urs]* habeas *B Gel* discat *Urs sec. Woww. (vel ipse Woww.?)*

revelabit quod deus texit? Unde sciscitandum est? Unde et ignorare tutissimum est. Praestat per deum nescire, quia non revelaverit, quam per hominem scire, quia ipse praesumpserit.

2. 1. Plane non negabimus aliquando philosophos iuxta nostra sensisse; testimonium est etiam veritatis eventus ipsius. Nonnunquam et in procella confusis vestigiis caeli et freti aliqui portus offenditur prospero errore, nonnunquam et in tenebris aditus quidam et exitus deprehenduntur caeca felicitate, sed et natura pleraque suggeruntur quasi de publico sensu, quo animam deus dotare dignatus est. 2. Hunc nacta philosophia ad gloriam propriae artis inflavit prae studio (non mirum, si istud ita dixerim) eloquii quidvis struere atque destruere eruditi magisque dicendo persuadentis quam docendo. Formas rebus imponit, eas nunc peraequat, nunc privat, de certis incerta praeiudicat, provocat ad exempla, quasi comparanda sint omnia, omnia praescribit, proprietatibus etiam inter similia diversis, nihil divinae licentiae servat, leges naturae opiniones suas fecit; ferrem, si naturalis ipsa, ut compos naturae de condicionis consortio probaretur. 3. Visa est quidem sibi et ex sacris, quas putant, litteris hausisse, quia plerisque auctores etiam deos existimavit antiquitas, nedum divos, ut Mercurium Aegyptium, cui praecipue Plato adsuevit, ut Silenum Phrygem, cui a pastoribus perducto ingentes aures suas Midas tradidit, ut Hermotimum, cui Clazomenii mortuo templum contulerunt, ut Orpheum, ut Musaeum, ut Pherecydem Pythagorae magistrum. Quid autem, si philosophi etiam illa incursaverunt, quae penes nos apocryphorum confessione damnantur, certos nihil recipiendum quod non conspiret germanae et ipso iam aevo pronatae propheticae paraturae, quando et pseudoprophetarum meminerimus et multo prius apostatarum spirituum, qui huiusmodi quoque ingeniorum calliditate omnem faciem saeculi instruxerint? 4. Postremo si etiam ad ipsos prophetas adisse credibile est indagatorem quemque sapientiae ex negotio curiositatis, tamen plus diversitatis invenias inter philosophos quam societatis, cum et in ipsa societate diversitas eorum deprehendatur, siquidem vera quaeque et consonantia prophetis aut aliunde commendant aut aliorum subornant cum maxima iniuria veritatis, quam efficiunt aut adiuvari falsis aut patrocinari. 5. Hoc itaque commiserit nos et philosophos in ista praesertim materia, quod

1. prius Unde] inde *Rig.* alterum Unde] inde *Scal* unde? *Iun* dubitanter et] at *Iun* dubitanter 5. etiam *del.* *Seml* inventus *Gel*
6. aliquis *Rig.* Helenismus Aliqui pro aliquis' *Bmg* 11. mirum, si *Gel* mirum non *B* (inter has voces lacunam undecim duodecimve litterarum exhibens) mirum, si et ego *Rfd* susp. 13. virgulam post eas ponit *B*
14. comparanda sint omnia, omnia *Urs*] comparanda sit, omnia *B* comparanda, omnia *Gel* comparanda omnia; *Iun* comparanda sic omnia, omnia *Hartel* ap. *Rfd* 15. proprietatibus *Lat*] propria aetatibus *B* *Gel*
16. legis *B* fecit *B*; vindicat *Lfst* *Krit. Apol.* 104] facit *Gel* 17. compos] cum post *B* 21. ingentem *B* 22. Hermotimum *Paul.* *Leopardus* *Emendat.* 8,3] Hermippum *B* *Gel* templo *B* 25. confusione *La* *Cerda* susp. 26. ipso] ipsorum *Iun* 31. inter philosophos] inter prophetas et philosophos *Rfd* susp. inter philosophos et prophetas v. d. *Vliet* 87/8

interdum communes sententias propriis argumentationibus vestiant, contrariis alicubi regulae nostrae, interdum sententias proprias communibus argumentationibus muniant, consentaneis alicubi regulae illorum, ut prope exclusa sit veritas a philosophia per veneficia in
 5 illam sua; et ideo utroque titulo societatis adversario veritatis urgemur et communes sententias ab argumentationibus philosophorum liberare et communes argumentationes a sententiis eorum separare, revocando quaestiones ad dei litteras, exceptis plane quae sine laqueo alicuius praeiudicii ad simplex testimonium licebit adsumere, quia et ex aemulis
 10 nonnunquam testimonium necessarium, si non aemulis prosit. 6. Nec ignoro, quanta sit silva materiae istius apud philosophos pro numero etiam ipsorum commentatorum, quot varietates sententiarum, quot palaestrae opinionum, quot propagines quaestionum, quot implicationes expeditionum. Sed et medicinam inspexi, sororem, ut aiunt,
 15 philosophiae, sibi quoque hoc negotium vindicantem. Quidni? ad quam magis animae ratio pertinere videatur per corporis curam. Unde et plurimum sorori refragatur, quod animam quasi coram in domicilio suo tractando magis norit. Sed viderit utriusque praestantiae ambitio. Habuit et philosophia libertatem ingenii et medicina necessi-
 20 tatem artificii ad extendendos de anima retractatus: late quaeruntur incerta, latius disputantur praesumpta. Quanta difficultas probandi, tanta operositas suadendi, ut merito Heraclitus ille tenebrosus vastiores caligines animadvertens apud examinatores animae taedio quaestionum pronuntiavit terminos animae nequaquam invenisse omnem viam
 25 ingrediendo. 7. Christiano autem paucis ad scientiam huius rei opus est. Nam et certa semper in paucis, et amplius illi quaerere non licet quam quod inveniri licet; infinitas enim quaestiones apostolus prohibet. Porro non amplius inveniri licet quam quod a deo discitur; quod autem a deo discitur, totum est.

30 3. 1. Atque utinam nullas haereses oportuisset existere, ut probabiles quique emicarent. Nihil omnino cum philosophis super anima quoque experiremur, patriarchis, ut ita dixerim, haereticorum, siquidem et ab apostolo iam tunc philosophia concussio veritatis providebatur; Athenis enim expertus linguatam civitatem cum
 35 omnes illic sapientiae atque facundiae caupones degustasset, inde concepit praemonitorium illud edictum. 2. Proinde enim et animae ratio per philosophatas doctrinas hominum miscentes aquas vino:

27. 1 Tim. 1, 4.

30. 1 Cor. 11, 19.

36. Coloss. 2, 8.

37. Jes. 1, 22.

4. in illam] in illa *Rfd* inlata *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,49 in illam <sua immiscente et illam in> sua *Kroym.* 101. 11. sylva *B Gel*, ut semper

15. Quidni? ad quam *Th. St. T.* 3,31] quidem, ad quam *B* ut ad quam *Gel* quippe ad quam *Rfd* ad quam quidem *Hartel ap. Rfd* (vel et quidem ad quam *Patr. Stud.* 4,49) 18. praestantiae] scientiae *Rfd susp.*

21. quanta difficultas probandi! quanta operositas suadendi! *Iun susp.*

24. invenisse *Gel*] inveniens *B* invenies *Rfd* 25. ingrediens *B*

27. infinitas] indefinitas *susp. Pam* (quem refutat *Iun*) et *La Cerd*

34. praevidebatur *Harrisius* 35. illic] illis *Pam* 1597 36. praemoni-

torum *B* Proinde] perinde *Rfd* quem refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,50 et] it *Hartel ap. Rfd*; quam coniecturam repudiat *Patr. Stud.* 4,50

alii immortalem negant animam, alii plus quam immortalem adfirmant, alii de substantia, alii de forma, alii de unaquaque dispositione disceptant; hi statum eius aliunde <de>ducunt, hi exitum aliorum abducunt, prout aut Platonis honor aut Zenonis vigor aut Aristotelis tenor aut Epicuri stupor aut Heracliti maeror aut Empedoclis furor persuaserunt. 3. Deliquit, opinor, divina doctrina ex Iudaea potius quam ex Graecia oriens. Erravit et Christus piscatores citius quam sophistam ad praeconium emittens. Si qua igitur in hunc modum de nidoribus philosophiae candidum et purum aerem veritatis infuscant, ea erunt Christianis enubilanda et percutientibus argumentationes originales, id est philosophicas, et opponentibus definitiones caelestes, id est dominicas, ut et illa quibus ethnici a philosophia capiuntur, destruantur, et haec quibus fideles ab haeresi concutiuntur, retundantur. 4. Una iam congressione decisa adversus Hermogenen, ut praefati sumus, quia animam ex dei flatu, non ex materia vindicamus, muniti et illic divinae determinationis inobscurabili regula: et flavit, inquit, deus flatum vitae in faciem hominis, et factus est homo in animam vivam, utique ex dei flatu, de isto nihil amplius revolvendum; habet suum titulum et suum haereticum. Ceteris hinc exordium inducam.

4. 1. Post definitionem census quaestionem status patitur. Consequens enim est, ut ex dei flatu animam professi initium ei deputaremus. Hoc Plato excludit innatam et infectam animam volens. Et natam autem docemus et factam ex initii constitutione. Nec statim erravimus utrumque dicentes, quia scilicet aliud sit natum, aliud factum, utpote <istud inanimalibus>, illud animalibus competens. Differentiae autem sua habendo loca et tempora habent aliquando et passivitatis commercia. Capit itaque et facturam pro in esse poni, siquidem omne quod quoquo modo accipit esse generatur. Nam et factor ipse parens facti potest dici; sic et Plato utitur. Igitur quantum ad fidem nostram factae nataeque animae, depulsa est philosophi opinio auctoritate prophetiae quoque.

16. Gen. 2, 7.

3. aliunde deducunt *Ist Spr. Tert. 76*] alium deducunt *B* aliunde ducunt *Gel et reliqui* 4. vigor] rigor *Pam Iun susp.* 8. sophistas *Urs* 11. originales] corruptum putat *Gomperz 61*, vocabulum quoddam ut obscurus vel terrenus vel daemoniacus dubitanter proponens; caliginosas *susp. Th. Gomperz ap. eundem 80* 13. post retundantur virgulam ponunt *Gel Lindn*, post flatu (*lin. 19*) punctum 14. En (ut praefati sumus) *B* 15. vindicavimus *Iun susp.*; *Rfd* 21. DE INNATA *B* DE SUBSTANTIA ANIMAE ET AN CORPORALIS *Gel* 22. deputemus *Urs* 25. statum *Rfd*; quod damnant *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,50*; v. d. *Vliet 88* errabimus *Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312* 26. istud (vel hoc) inanimalibus v. d. *Vliet 88 addit*; approbat *Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312*] om. libri omnes 27. habendae *Rig.* 28. pro in esse *Kellner 293*] pro inesse *B Gel*; quod falso vindicavi *Mnemos. III 3 (1936), 169* pro nasci *Pam* dici generari, pro in esse *Urs* perinde esse *Hartel ap. Rfd* proinde vel perinde esse *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,51* provenisse *Oehl promiscue Lindn v. d. Vliet 88/9* 31. post animae punctum ponit *Rfd* philosophiae *Kroym. 102 (preli lapsu?)* qui post hanc vocem magnam partem operis intercidisse putat 31—32. opinio: auctoritate prophetiae quoque *B* distinguit

5. 1. Accerserit Eubulum aliquem et Critolaum et Xenocraten et isto in loco amicum Platonis Aristotelen. Fortassean exstruentur magis ad auferendam animae corpulentiam, si non alios e contrario inspexerint, et quidem plures, corpus animae vindicantes. 2. Nec
 5 illos dico solos qui eam de manifestis corporalibus effingunt, ut Hipparchus et Heraclitus ex igni, ut Hippon et Thales ex aqua, ut Empedocles et Critias ex sanguine, ut Epicurus ex atomis (si et atomi corpulentias de coitu suo cogunt), ut Critolaus et Peripatetici eius ex
 10 quinta nescio qua substantia (si et illa corpus, quia corpora includit), sed etiam Stoicos allego, qui spiritum praedicantes animam paene nobiscum, qua proxima inter se flatus et spiritus, tamen corpus animam facile persuadebunt. 3. Denique Zeno consitum spiritum definiens animam hoc modo instruit. Quo, inquit, digresso animal emoritur, corpus est; consito autem spiritu
 15 digresso animal emoritur, ergo consitus spiritus corpus est; ergo corpus est anima. 4. Vult et Cleanthes non solum corporis lineamentis, sed et animae notis similitudinem parentibus in filiis respondere, de speculo scilicet morum et ingeniorum et adfectuum, corporis autem similitudinem et dissimilitudinem capere et animam, itaque corpus
 20 similitudini vel dissimilitudini obnoxium. 5. Item corporalium et incorporealium passiones inter se non communicare; porro et animam compati corpori, cui laeso ictibus vulneribus ulceribus condolescit, et corpus animae, cui afflictae cura angore amore coaegrescit per detrimentum socii vigoris, cuius pudorem et pavorem rubore atque pallore
 25 testetur. Igitur anima corpus ex corporalium passionum communione. 6. Sed et Chrysippus manum ei porrigit constituens corporalia ab incorporalibus derelinqui omnino non posse, quia nec contingantur ab eis (unde et Lucretius: tangere enim et tangi nisi corpus nulla potest res), derelicto autem corpore ab anima affici morte.

28. Lucr. 1,305.

1. accerserint *Iun* 2. Aristotelen. Fortassean *Petr. Ciacconius*] Aristotelem fortasse an *B* Aristotelem fortasse. An *Gel* Aristotelen fortasse an *Urs* auferendum *Iun* 3. non] nos *Seml* 6. Hipparchus] Hippasus *Iun susp.* 14. corpus] anima *Gomperz* 62 digresso *om. B*
 15. consitus] consitus autem *B* corpus] anima *Gomperz* 62 *prius* est] est; consitus autem spiritus anima est *Urs* est; consitus autem spiritus corpus est *Gomperz* 62 16. cleantes *B* (Cleanthes *Bmg*) 17. filiis *Iun*] filios *B Gel*; dubitant *Th. St. Tert.* 1,50 et *Hoppe Gnom.* 11 (1935), 252 filios, respondere de speculo *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,51 distinguit; quem refutat *Th. St. T.* 1,50 18. corporis autem, similitudinem... capere; et animam itaque corpus *Iun distinguit*; *Arnim St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518 19. corporis *Rfd*; contra quem disputat *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,51 20. si similitudini *Gomperz* 63; refutat *Th. St. T.* 1,51 obnoxiam *Hicks (St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518) *Rfd* obnoxia *Gomperz* 63 (qui ib. 80 hanc coniecturam repudiat) et (dubitanter) *Th. St. T.* 1, 51; sed cf. *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,51 Item] interim *Rfd*; refutat *Hartel l.c.*
 23. coaegrescit *Lat*] cohaerescit *B Gel* 24. socii *Gel*] societ *B* scilicet *Urs* saucii *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,52 suci et *Th. St. T.* 1,52 cuiusque *Rfd* et cuius *susp. Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,52 pavore *B* 25. animam *Iun* communione] communicatione *Arnim, St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518 29. affici] hominem affici *Rfd* corpus cogitandum putat *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,53; sed cf. *Lfst. Spr. T.* 56,

Igitur corpus anima, quae nisi corporalis corpus non derelinquet.

6. 1. Haec Platonici subtilitate potius quam veritate conturbant. Omne, inquiunt, corpus aut animale sit necesse est aut inanimale. Et si quidem inanimale est, extrinsecus movebitur, si vero animale, intrinsecus. Anima autem nec extrinsecus movebitur, ut quae non sit inanimalis, nec intrinsecus, ut quae ipsa potius moveat corpus. Itaque non videri eam corpus, quae non corporalium forma ex aliqua regione moveatur. 2. Ad hoc nos mirabimur incongruentiam primo definitionis provocantis ad ea quae in animam non conveniunt. Non enim potest anima animale corpus dici aut inanimale, cum ipsa sit quae aut faciat corpus animale, si adsit, aut inanimale, si absit ab illo. Itaque quod facit non potest esse ipsa, ut dicatur animale vel inanimale. Anima enim dicitur substantiae suae nomine. (3). Quodsi non capit animale corpus dici aut inanimale, quod est anima, quomodo provocabitur ad animalium et inanimalium corporum formam? 3. Dehinc si corporis est moveri extrinsecus ab aliquo, ostendimus autem supra moveri animam et ab alio, cum vaticinatur, cum furit, utique extrinsecus, cum ab alio, merito quod movebitur extrinsecus ab alio secundum exempli propositionem corpus agnoscam. Enimvero si ab alio moveri corporis est, quanto magis movere aliud? Anima autem movet corpus, et conatus eius extrinsecus foris parent. Ab illa est enim impingi et pedes in incessum et manus in contactum et oculos in conspectum et linguam in effatum, velut sigillario motu superficiem intus agitante. Unde haec vis incorporalis animae? Unde vacuae rei solida propellere? 4. Sed quomodo divisi videntur in homine sensus corporales et intellectuales? Corporalium aiunt rerum qualitates, ut terrae, ut ignis, corporalibus sensibus renuntiari, ut tactui, ut visui, incorporalium vero intellectualibus conveniri, ut benignitatis, ut malignitatis. Itaque incorporalem esse animam constat cuius qualitates non corporalibus, sed intellectualibus sensibus comprehendantur. 5. Plane, si non huius definitionis gradum exclusero. Ecce enim incorporalia ostendo corporalibus sensibus subici, sonum auditui, colorem conspectui, odorem odoratui, quorum exemplo etiam anima corpori accedit, ne dicas idcirco ea per corporales renuntiari sensus, quia corporalibus accedant. Igitur si constat incorporalia

1. anima] animam *Iun* quae nisi corporalis *Gel*] quam si corporali *B* a qua nisi corporali *Kroym.* 102 derelinquet. 2. Haec *Gel*] derelinquet. Videntur haec *B* derelinqueret. Haec *Pam* derelinquere videretur. Haec *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,53 derelinqueret. videtur. Haec *Rfd* derelinqueretur. Haec *Kroym.* 102 2. Platonici *B* veritate. Conturbant omne. Inquiunt *B distinguunt* 11. si adsit, aut inanimale *om. B* 18. cum *Gel*] qui *B* quis *Urs* quia *Oehl susp.*; *Rfd*; delet *Iun* 19. agnoscam *Gel*] adgnoscam *B* Enimvero] iamvero *Rfd* 21. extrinsecus *B Gel*] intrinsecus *Kroym.* 103 foris delendum putat *Fr. Leo ap. Kroym.* 103 23. singillario *Pam* sigillaria *Rfd*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,53 motus *B* 24. agitantem *B* vis *Lat*] visio *B Gel* incorporalis *B*; vindicat *Th. St. Tert.* 1,10] incorporali reliqui 25. interrogationis signum post propellere primus posuit *Lat* 26. homines *B* 27. terra *B Gel* 28. tactu *Urs visu Urs* 29. ut] aut *Gel* vel *Rig* 30. sensibus] „alii corrupte legunt . . . censibus” *Iun* 35. sensus] „alii census; vitiosissime” *Iun*

quoque a corporalibus comprehendī, cur non et anima, quae corporalis, ab incorporalibus renuntietur? Certe definitio exclusā sit. 6. De insignioribus argumentationibus erit etiam illa, quod omne corpus corporalibus ali iudicant, animam vero, ut incorporalem, incorporalibus, sapientiae scilicet studiis. Sed nec hic gradus stabit etiam Sorano methodicae medicinae instructissimo auctore respondente animam corporalibus quoque ali, denique deficientem a cibo plerumque fulciri. Quidni? quo adempto in totum dilabatur ex corpore. Ita etiam ipse Soranus plenissime super anima commentatus quattuor voluminibus et cum omnibus philosophorum sententiis expertus corporalem animae substantiam vindicat, etsi illam immortalitate fraudavit. Non enim omnium est credere quod Christianorum est. 7. Sicut ergo Soranus ipse rebus ostendit animam corporalibus ali, proinde et philosophus exhibeat illam incorporalibus pasci. Sed nemo unquam cunctanti de exitu animae mulsam aquam de eloquio Platonis infudit f. 118^v aut micas / de minutiloquio Aristotelis infersit. Quid autem facient tot ac tantae animae rupicum et barbarorum, quibus alimenta sapientiae desunt, et tamen / indoctae prudentia pollent, et sine academiis et porticibus Atticis et carceribus Socratis, denique ieiunantes a philosophia, nihilominus vivunt? Non enim substantiae ipsi alimenta proficiunt studiorum, sed disciplinae, quia nec opimiorē animam efficiunt, sed ornatiorem. Bene autem quod et artes Stoici corporales affirmant. Adeo sic quoque anima corporalis, si et artibus ali creditur. 8. Sed enormis intentio philosophiae solet plerumque nec prospicere pro pedibus (sic Thales in puteum). Solet et sententias suas non intellegendo valetudinis corruptelam suspicari (sic Chrysippus ad elleborum). Tale aliquid, opinor, ei accidit, cum duo in unum corpora negavit, alienata a prospectu et recogitatu praegnantum, quae non singula cotidie corpora, sed et bina et terna in unius uteri ambitu perferunt. Invenitur etiam in iure civili Graeca quaedam quinionem enixa, filiorum semel omnium mater, unici fetus parens multiplex, unici uteri puerpera numerosa, quae tot stipata corporibus, paene dixerim populo, sextum ipsa corpus fuit. 9. Universa conditio testa-

4. ali iudicant Gel] adiudicant B 7. deficientem a Gel] deficiente in ea B
deficientem eam Urs 8. etiam] et ne B 11. fraudabit B
13. perinde Rfd 14. incorporalibus] ita corporalibus B
15. mulsam B 16. de minutiloquio A qui ab his verbis incipit de multi-
loquio Bmg aristotelis A ut semper except. p. 19, 12 intersit B Gel; post infersit
interrogationis signum ponit Rfd 17. Rupicum B Gel barbarorum]
baronum P. Pithoeus Urs quibus] quibus si Iun 18. prius et om. B Gel
indoctae A; approbat Gomperz 63/4] indocta B Gel 19. carceribus
Socratis] caesaribus socratis A a om. A 21. sed] vel Rfd; quem
refutat Gomperz 64 quiu A corr. nec] net A 24. nec] net A
25. sic] scit Heraldus tales A et om. A 26. sic] scit Heraldus
ad elleborum] adleborum A Bmg ad Delleborum B 27. in om. Rig
28. alienato Iun alienatus Urs; lectionem traditam vindicant Kroym. 103
Gomperz 2 praegnantum . . . 29. singula] pregnata umquam e non
singulatiu A 29. singula tantum Kroym. 103 quotidie A
et bina] labina A vel bina Wissowa ap. Rfd terna] terrena A Gel
30. praeferrunt Gel 31. virgulam ante filiorum ponit A solus fetus] festus A
33. condicio A

bitur corpora de corporibus processura iam illic esse unde procedunt. Secundum sit necesse est quod ex alio est. Nihil porro ex alio est, nisi, dum gignitur, duo sunt.

7. 1. Quantum ad philosophos satis haec, quia quantum ad nostros ex abundanti; quibus corporalitas animae in ipso evangelio relucebit. Dolet apud inferos anima cuiusdam et punitur in flamma et cruciatur in lingua et de digito animae felicioris implorat solacium roris. 2. Imaginem existimas exitum illum pauperis laetantis et divitis maerentis? Et quid illic Eleazari nomen, / si non in veritate res est? f. 119^v Sed etsi imago credenda est, testimonium erit veritatis. Si enim non haberet anima corpus, non caperet imago animae imaginem corporis, nec mentiretur de corporalibus membris scriptura, si non erant. 3. Quid est autem illud quod ad inferna transfertur post divortium corporis, quod detinetur illic, quod in diem iudicii reservatur, ad quod et Christus moriendo descendit (puto, ad animas patriarcharum), si nihil anima sub terris? Nihil enim, si non corpus; incorporeitas enim ab omni genere custodiae libera est, immunis et a poena et a fovea. Per quod enim punitur aut fovetur, hoc erit corpus; reddam de isto plenius et oportunius. 4. Igitur si quid tormenti sive solacii anima praecepit in carcere seu deversorio inferum, in igni vel in sinu Abrahæ, probata erit corporalitas animae. Incorporeitas enim nihil patitur, non habens per quod pati possit; aut si habet, hoc erit corpus. In quantum enim omne corporale passibile est, in tantum quod passibile est corporale est.

8. 1. Abruptum alioquin et absurdum idcirco quid de corporalium eximere censu, quia ceteris corporalibus exemplis non adaequet. Et ubi proprietatum privata discrimina, per quae magnificentia auctoris ex operum eorundem diversitate signatur, ut sint tam discreta quam paria, tam amica quam et aemula? Siquidem et ipsi philosophi ex contrariis universa constare condicunt secundum amicitiam et inimicitiam Empedoclis. 2. Sic igitur etsi corporalia incorporeis obiacent, ipsa quoque ita inter se differunt, ut differentia species eorum ampliet, non genus mutet, ut sint corporalia, sic multa in dei gloria, dum varia, sic varia, dum diversa, sic diversa, dum his alii qualitatibus / f. 120

6 sqq. Luc. 16, 22 seqq.

2. secundum] seorsum Bmg alterum est A] sit B Gel 3. gignitur, duo A; approbat Kroym. 103] gignitur. Sed tunc duo B Gel 4. haec, quia] haec quidem, Iun 9. eleazari A] Lazari B Gel est om. Rig. 13. devortium mavult Iun 14. illic om. A 15. patriarcharum, si A; approbat Kroym. 104] patriarcharum, sed quamobrem? si B Gel 16. sub] detinet sub B Gel; Iun dubitat, utrum anima detinet sub an animae detinetur sub scribendum sit 17. enim om. A liber est A prius et om. B Gel 18. fovea Gel 19. opportunius B Gel 20. praecepit Rig in carcere] in corpore A carcere in corpore B sine corpore in carcere Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,53 deversorio Iun mavult] di-A 23. quantum A corr. 26. exime recensu A adaeque Iun Et ubi A B] ubi Gel ubique Rfd susp. 28. discretam A 31. Empedoclis om. A 31. incorporeis . . . 33. corporalia om. A 32. ita om. Rig 33. gloriam Iun Urs; dubitat Lfst ap. Hoppe Beitr. 27, 34. sic varia om. A

sensus, alii illis, dum his alia alimenta, alia illis, dum haec invisibilia, illa visibilia, dum haec gravia, illa levia. 3. Aiunt enim et idcirco animam incorporalem renuntiandam, quia digressa ea graviora efficiantur corpora defunctorum, cum leviora esse deberent, unius
 5 corporis pondere exempto, si anima corpus. Quid enim, inquit Soranus, si mare negent corpus, quia extra mare immobilis et gravis navis efficitur? Quanto ergo validius corpus animae, quod tanti postea ponderis corpus levissima mobilitate circumfert! 4. Ceterum etsi invisibilis anima, et pro condicione corporis sui et proprietate sub-
 10 stantiae et pro natura etiam eorum quibus invisibilis esse sortita est. Solem noctuae nesciunt oculis; aquilae ita sustinent, ut natorum suorum generositatem de pupillarum audacia iudicent; alioquin non educabunt, ut degenerem, quem solis radius averterit. 5. Est adeo alteri quid invisibile, alteri non, quod non ideo incorporale sit, quia
 15 non ex aequo vis valet. Sol enim corpus, siquidem ignis; sed quod aquila confiteatur, neget noctua, non tamen praeiudicans aquilae. Tantundem et animae corpus invisibile carni, si forte, spiritui vero visibile est. Sic Iohannes in spiritu dei factus animas martyrum conspicit.

9. 1. Cum animae corpus adserimus propriae qualitatis et sui
 20 generis, iam haec condicio proprietatis de ceteris accidentibus corpulentiae praeiudicabit aut haec adesse, quam corpus ostendimus, sed et ipsa sui generis pro corporis proprietate, aut etsi non adsint, hoc esse proprietatis, non adesse corpori animae quae corporibus / ceteris
 f. 120^v adsint. Et tamen non inconstanter profitebimur sollemniora quaeque
 25 et omnimodo debita corpulentiae adesse animae quoque, ut habitum, ut terminum, ut illud trifariam distantivum, longitudinem dico et latitudinem et sublimitatem, quibus metantur corpora philosophi. 2. Quid nunc, quod et effigiem animae damus, Platone nolente, quasi periclitetur de animae immortalitate? Omne enim effigiatum
 30 compositum et structile affirmat; dissolubile autem omne compositi-

18. Apoc. 6, 9.

1. alimenta. alii *A* 3. renunciandam *A* 6. mare *om. A*
 7. animae ... 8. corpus *om. A* 8. caeterum *A*, ut *ubique* etsi *B*] est
A corr. et si *Gel* est *Lat*, *Lat.* est; aliter profecto malim etsi' *Iun*; *lectionem*
traditam vindicat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4, 54 9. prius et] at *Iun* *mauult* est *Oehl*
 pro proprietate *Gel* 10. post invisibilis *virgulam ponunt Iun Lindn*
 11. nesciunt; oculis *F. J. Doelger distinguendum putat oculi Urs*
 12. sorum *A* alioqui *B Gel* 13. adeo] ideo *B Gel* 14. alteri ...
 invisibile *om. A* *ideo *A* 15. vis] visus *Iun susp.* 16. nontamen
 (*prius t m. rec.*) *A* 17. anima *A* 18. est *om. B Gel* Sic Iohannes] scio
 hanne *A* 19. DE EFFIGIE (— *AE A*) *A B* DE EFFIGIE ANIMAE
Gel asserimus *A* et sui *B Gel*; *vindicat Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312*
 et sensui *A* esse et sui *Gomperz 64* 20. caeteris *A* 21. praeiudicavit *B Gel*
 aut *Urs*] ut *A B Gel* et *Oehl* adesse] adesse ei *Urs*; *damnat Hoppe*
Beitr. 111 quam] qua *Pam Iun* ostendamus *Gel* 23. ceteris *Iun*
 caeteris *A* et ceteris (*cae-B*) *B Gel* 24. sollemniora *B Gel*, ut *semper*
 26. distantivum (*vel distinctivum Lat*) *Lat Iun*] distantium *A B Gel* dis-
 tentivum *Urs* dico et *om. A* 28. interrogationis signum post nolente
ponunt B Gel, post *damus Oehl Rfd* 29. pereclitetur *A* 30. est *A corr.*

cium et structile; sed animam immortalem, igitur indissolubilem, qua immortalem, et ineffigiatam, qua indissolubilem, ceterum compositiciam et structilem, si effigiatam, tamquam alio eam modo effigians intellectualibus formis, pulchram iustitia et disciplinis philosophiae, deformem vero contrariis artibus. 3. Sed nos corporales quoque illi inscribimus lineas, non tantum ex fiducia corporalitatis per aestimationem, verum et ex constantia gratiae per revelationem. Nam quia spiritalia charismata agnoscimus, post Iohannem quoque prophetiam meruimus consequi. 4. Est hodie soror apud nos revelationum charismata sortita, quas in ecclesia inter dominica sollemnia per ecstasin in spiritu patitur; conversatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum domino, et videt et audit sacramenta et quorundam corda dinoscit et medicinas desiderantibus sumit. Iamvero prout scripturae leguntur aut psalmi canuntur aut allocutiones proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiae visionibus subministrantur. Forte nescio quid de anima disserueramus, cum ea soror in spiritu esset. Post transacta sollemnia / dimissa plebe, quo usu solet nobis renuntiare quae viderit (nam et diligentissime digeruntur, ut etiam probentur), 'inter cetera', inquit, 'ostensa est mihi anima corporaliter, et spiritus videbatur, sed non inanis et vacuae qualitatis, immo quae etiam teneri repromitteret, tenera et lucida et aërii coloris, et forma per omnia humana. Hoc visio'. Et deus testis et apostolus charismatum in ecclesia futurorum idoneus sponsor; tunc et si res ipsa de singulis persuaserit, credas. 5. Si enim corpus anima, sine dubio inter illa quae supra sumus professi, proinde et coloris proprietas omni corpori aderit. Quem igitur alium animae aestimabis colorem quam aërium ac lucidum? Non, ut aer sit ipsa substantia eius, etsi hoc Aenesidemo visum est et Anaximeni, puto secundum quosdam et Heraclito, nec ut lumen, etsi hoc placuit Pontico Heraclidi 6. — nam et cerauniis gemmis non ideo substantia ignita est, quod coruscent rutilato rubore, nec berullis ideo aquosa materia est, quod fluctuent colato nitore

2. qua immortalem . . . indissolubilem *om. A* qua (*bis*)
Scal Urs] quam (*bis*) *B Gel* 5. Sed] et *A* 8. iohannem *A*
virgulam post post Iohannem quoque ponit Iun 9. consequi]
et consequi *B Gel* 11. extasin *A, ut semper* 13. dignoscit
Rig sumit] submittit *Pam* Iamvero] ita vero *A; in mg. m. librarii*
Nota formam veteris celebrationis 15. matheriae *A* 16. spiritum *A*
17. dimissa * *A* uso *A corr.* 18. renunciare *A* quae viderit nam
et dili-deest in *A (p. f. i.)* 19. inquit deest in *A (p. f. i.)* 20. videbntur
A corr. alterum et] nec *A* 21. aërii *A B Aug. gen. ad litt. 10, 25]*
aetherii *Bmg Gel* aerei *Pam* 22. Hoc visio. Et deus *Lindn*] Hoc visio,
et deus *A*. Haec visio est. Deus *B Gel* Hoc visio'. Sed deus *Kroym. 104*
23. tunc et * * si *A* tunc et si *B*] tu nisi *Gel* tu nec si *Rig* tu negas; sed
si *Fr. Leo ap. Kroym. 104* 24. credas] ne credas *Gel; lectionem traditam*
vindicat Th. St. T. 2,85/6 post dubio *Rfd* aliquid intercidisse putat,
ut teneri eam et teneram esse inter] in se fert *Hartel ap. Rfd* et fert
(vel in se fert) *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,55* illa] alia susp. *Gomperz 64*
25. post professi punctum ponunt *B Gel* perinde *Rfd* omni] ut
omni susp. *Gomperz 64/5; quem refutat Th. St. T. 1,23* 26. aderit *A*;
vindicant Gomperz 64/5 et Th. St. T. 1,23] adhaeret *B Gel* Quem] quae
aëreum *Pam* 27. ut aer] uter *A* aeneas idemo *A* Enesidemo *B*
29. et *om. A* cerauniis *Iun*] cerauneis *A B Gel* 31. nec] nec et *A corr.*
beryllis *B Gel* aquos amateria *A* flutuent *A* collato *B*

(quanta enim et alia color sociat, natura dissociat) —, sed quoniam omne tenue atque perlucidum aeris aemulum est, hoc erit anima, qua flatus et spiritus tradux, siquidem prae ipsa tenuitatis subtilitate de fide corporalitatis periclitatur. 7. Sic et effigiem de sensu iam
 5 tuo concipe non aliam animae humanae deputandam praeter humanam, et quidem eius corporis quod unaquaeque circumtulit. Hoc nos sapere interim primordii contemplatio inducat. Recogita enim, cum deus flasset in faciem homini flatum vitae, et factus esset homo in animam vivam, totus utique, per faciem statim flatum illum in
 f. 121^v 10 interiora / transmissum et per universa corporis spatia diffusum simulque divina aspiratione densatum omni intus linea expressum esse, quam densatus impleverat, et velut in forma gelasse. 8. Inde igitur et corpulentia animae ex densatione solidata est et effigies ex
 15 impressione formata. Hic erit homo interior, alius exterior, dupliciter unus, habens et ille oculos et aures suas, quibus populus dominum audire et videre debuerat, habens et ceteros artus, per quos et in cogitationibus utitur et in somniis fungitur. Sic et diviti apud inferos lingua est, et pauperi digitus, et sinus Abrahae. Per has lineas et animae martyrum sub altari intelleguntur. A primordio enim in
 20 Adam concreta et configurata corpori anima, ut totius substantiae, ita et condicionis istius semen effecit.

10. 1. Pertinet ad statum fidei simplicem animam determinare secundum Platonem, id est uniformem, dumtaxat substantiae nomine. Viderint artes et disciplinae, viderint et effigies. 2. Quidam enim
 25 volunt aliam illi substantiam naturalem inesse spiritum, quasi aliud sit vivere, quod venit ab anima, aliud spirare, quod fiat a spiritu. Nam et animalibus non omnibus utrumque adesse; pleraque enim vivere solummodo, non etiam spirare, eo quod non habeant organa spiritus, pulmones et arterias. 3. Quale est autem in examinatione
 30 humanae animae culicis atque formicae argumenta respicere, quando et vitalia pro cuiusque generis dispositione omnibus propria animalibus

15. Jer. 5, 21.

3. flatus *A*] flatus est *B Gel* 5. non aliam] alienam *A Bmg*
 6. et quidem *Gel*] etsi quidem *A* et si quidem *B* et, siquidem, *Gomperz 65* nos] nobis *A* 7. contemplatio *A* recogitat *A*
 8. homini *A*] hominis *B Gel*; vindicat *Th. Eran. 7 (1907), 84*
 9. totus *A B*; vindicat *Th. St. T. 2, 30/1*] totum *Gel* utique] itaque *A corr.* 10. transmissum et per univers-deest in *A (p.f.i.)* 11. divina deest in *A (p.f.i.)* densatum]defusatum *A*
 12. quam] quem *A* densatus *Iun*] densatur *A* densatum *B Gel*
 13. ex impressione *A*; vindicat *Th. St. T. 2, 31*] expressione *B Gel* ex expressione *Rfd* 15. populus] Paulus *Urs*; lectionem traditam vindicant *Lindn Kroym 104 Kellnerus 300₂* domino *A Bmg* 17. cogitationibus *A Aug l. c.*] cogitatibus *B Gel* somnis *Aug l. c.*; *Pam* 21. conditionis *B Gel* efficit *B Gel* 22. DE SIMPLICITATE SUBSTANTIAE QUOD ET SPIRITUS IPSA SIT *A B UNUM ESSE ANIMAM ET SPIRITUM Gel*
 23. dumtaxat *B* 24. effigies] haereses *Urs*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Kroym. 105* 25. quasi... 26. spiritu *om. A* 28. *eo *A* 29. quales *A corr.* examinatione] animatione *A Bmg*

temperaverit artifex deus, ut nulla inde / coniectura captanda sit? f. 122
 Nam neque homo, si pulmonibus et arteriis structus est, idcirco
 aliunde spirabit, aliunde vivet, neque formica, si membris huiusmodi
 caret, idcirco negabitur spirare, quasi solummodo vivens. 4. Cui
 vero tantum patuit in dei opera, ut alicui haec deesse praesumpserit? 5
 Herophilus ille medicus aut lanius, qui sexcentos exsecuit, ut naturam
 scrutaretur, qui hominem odiit, ut nosset, nescio an omnia interna
 eius liquido explorarit, ipsa morte mutante quae vixerant, et morte
 non simplici, sed ipsa inter artificia exsectionis errante. 5. Philosophi
 pro certo renuntiaverunt culicibus et formicis et tineis deesse pulmones 10
 et arterias. Dic mihi, inspector curiosissime, oculos habent ad viden-
 dum? Atquin et pergunt quo volunt, et vitant et appetunt quae
 videndo sciunt: designa oculos, denota pupulas. Sed et exedunt
 tineae: demonstra mandibulas, deprome genuinos. Sed et personant
 culices, ne in tenebris quidem aurium caeci: tubam pariter et lanceam 15
 oris illius ostende. Quodvis animal, unius licet puncti, aliquo alatur
 necesse est: exhibe pabuli transmittendi decoquendi defaecandique
 membra. (6.) Quid ergo dicemus? Si per haec vivitur, erunt haec
 in omnibus utique quae vivent, etsi non videntur, etsi non apprehen-
 duntur pro mediocritate. Hoc magis credas, si deum recogites tantum 20
 artificem in modicis quantum et in maximis. 6. Si vero non putas
 capere tam minuta corpuscula dei ingenium, sic quoque magnificen-
 tiam eius agnoscas, quod modicis animalibus sine necessariis membris
 nihilominus vivere instruxerit, salvo etiam visu sine oculis et esu sine
 denticulis et digestu sine alveis, quemadmodum et incedunt quaedam 25
 sine pedibus / manante impetu, quod angues, et insurgente conatu, f. 122^v
 quod vermes, et spumante reptatu, quod limaces. 7. Ita et spirari
 cur non putes sine pulmonum foliis et sine fistulis arteriarum, ut
 pro magno amplectaris argumento idcirco animae humanae spiritum
 accedere, quia sint quae spiritu careant, et idcirco ea spiritu carere, 30
 quia de flaturalibus artibus structa non sint? Vivere sine spiritu
 existimas aliquid, spirare sine pulmonibus non putas? Quid est, oro
 te, spirare? Flatum, opinor, ex semetipso agere. Quid est vivere?
 Flatum, opinor, ex semetipso non agere. Hoc enim respondere debebo,
 si non idem est spirare quod vivere. Sed mortui erit non agere flatum: 35

1. aptanda A 2. neque... 3. vivet om. A 3. spiravit B 4. caret in rasura
 exhibet A 5. haec om. A 6. aut lanius,] an lanius? Iun * qui A
 septingentos B (al. sexcentos Bmg) 7. scrutaretur A corr. odiit] odit
 Iun quam lectionem vindicat Lfst Spr. Tert. 101 putans in A odit extare quod
 falso renuntiant Oehl Rfd occidit Diels Dox. 206, 9. simplicis A sed et
 ipsa Kellner 301, exsectionis A B Gel errante. Philosophi] errante
 philosopho B errantes philosophi Gel 10. cu * libus A corr. 13. pupillas
 B Gel et om. A; cf. Hoppe Beitr. 149, 14. mandibula Iun
 15. aurium] venarum Rfd susp. lanceam] hiantiam B Gel 16. puncti
 spatio aliquo Rfd susp.; quem refutat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,55 17. exhibeas
 B Gel pa * buli A 19. vivunt] videntur Bmg vivunt Iun susp.;
 approbat Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312 19. adpraehendantur B 23. quod
 modicis] quomodo dicis A 24. visu] usu B 28. interrogationis signum
 post arteriarum, non post sint (31) ponunt B Gel 29. amplecturis
 A corr. 31. de om. B Gel artubus Gel partibus Iun 33. ex
 semetipsum A est vivere? A; Kroym. 105] est non vivere? B Gel

ergo viventis est agere flatum. Sed et spirantis est agere flatum: ergo et spirare viventis est. Utrumque si sine anima decurrere potuisset, non fuisset animae spirare, sed solummodo vivere. At enim vivere spirare est et spirare vivere est. Ergo totum hoc et spirare et vivere
 5 eius est cuius et vivere, id est animae. 8. Denique si separas spiritum naturam, separa et opera: agant in discreto aliquid ambo, seorsum anima, seorsum spiritus; anima sine spiritu vivat, spiritus sine anima spiret; alterum relinquat corpora, alterum remaneat, mors et vita convenient. Si enim duo sunt anima et spiritus, dividi possunt, ut
 10 divisione eorum alterius discedentis, alterius inmanentis, mortis et vitae concursus eveniat. Sed nullo modo eveniet; ergo duo non erunt, quae dividi non possunt, quae dividi possent, si fuissent. 9. [Sed licet et duo esse concreta]. Sed non erunt concreta, si aliud est vivere, aliud spirare: distinguunt substantias opera. Et quanto nunc firmitus
 15 est, ut unum credas, cum distantiam non das, ut ipsa sit anima
 f. 123 spiritus, dum ipsius est spirare / cuius et vivere? Quid enim, si diem aliud haberi velis, aliud lucem, quae accedat diei, cum dies ipsa lux sit? Plane erunt et alia genera lucis, ut ex ignium ministerio. Erunt enim et aliae spiritus species, ut ex deo, ut ex diabolo. Ita cum de
 20 anima et spiritu agitur, ipsa erit anima spiritus, sicut ipsa dies lux. Ipsum est enim quid, per quod est quid.

11. 1. Sed ut animam spiritum dicam, praesentis quaestionis ratio compellit, quia spirare alii substantiae adscribitur. Hoc dum animae vindicamus, quam uniformem et simplicem agnoscimus, spiritum
 25 necesse est certa condicione dicamus, non status nomine, sed actus, nec substantiae titulo, sed operae, quia spirat, non quia spiritus proprie est. Nam et flare spirare est. Ita et animam, quam flatum ex proprietate defendimus, spiritum nunc ex necessitate pronuntiamus. 2. Ceterum adversus Hermogenem, qui eam ex materia,
 30 non ex dei flatu contendit, flatum proprie tuemur. Ille enim adversus ipsius scripturae fidem flatum in spiritum vertit, ut, dum incredibile est spiritum dei in delictum et mox in iudicium devenire, ex materia potius anima credatur quam ex dei spiritu. Idcirco nos et illic flatum eam defendimus, non spiritum, secundum scripturam et secundum
 35 spiritus distinctionem, et hic spiritum ingratis pronuntiamus secundum

1. viventis . . . ergo om. A 2. si] sin A corr. 4. et spirare vivere est] si et spirare vivere B Gel Ergo A] si ergo B sic ergo Gel
 5. id est om. A seorsum A corr. 6. natura A] naturam B Gel
 et animam Urs et animam naturam (aut naturam) Kroym. 105 indiscreto A
 10. manentis B Gel 12. prius quae dividi . . . 13. sed non erunt uncinis inclusit B possunt, quae dividi om. B quae dividi possent . . . sed non erunt om. Gel Ergo duo non erunt, quae dividi non possunt. Concretas, si aliud est vivere, aliud spirare, distinguunt substantias opera Iun 12. si] et B si duo Rfd; quod damnat Kroym. 105/6
 13. et om. B 14. distinguunt A 15. virgulam post das posuit v. d. Viet 90
 17. accedat A] accidat B Gel 18. planae A ut] aut A 20. *spiritus A
 21. enim] etiam Iun 25. condicione A 27. propriae A 31. ipsius om. A 35. ingratis Iun pronunciamus A corr. pronuntiamus. Secundum B distinguit

spirandi et flandi communionem. Illic de substantia quaestio est; spirare enim substantiae actus est. 3. Nec diutius de isto, nisi propter haereticos, qui nescio quod spiritale semen infulciunt animae de Sophiae matris occulta liberalitate conlatum ignorante factore, cum scriptura factoris magis dei sui conscia nihil amplius promulgaverit ⁵ quam deum flantem / in faciem hominis flatum vitae et hominem f. 123^v factum in animam vivam, per quam exinde et vivat et spiret, satis declarata differentia spiritus et animae in sequentibus instrumentis, ipso deo pronuntiante: spiritus ex me prodivit, et flatum omnem ego feci. Et anima enim flatus factus ex ¹⁰ spiritu. Et rursus: qui dedit flatum populo super terram et spiritum calcantibus eam. Primo enim anima, id est flatus, populo in terra incedenti, id est in carne carnaliter agentis, postea spiritus eis qui terram calcant, id est opera carnis subigunt, quia et apostolus non primum quod spiritale, sed quod ¹⁵ animale, postea spiritale. 4. Nam etsi Adam statim prophetavit magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam: hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro ex carne mea; propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem et agglutinabit se mulieri suae, et erunt duo in ²⁰ unam carnem, accidentiam spiritus passus est: cecidit enim ecstasis super illum, sancti spiritus vis operatrix prophetiae. 5. Nam et malus spiritus accidens res est. Denique Saulem tam dei spiritus postea vertit in alium virum, id est in propheten, cum dictum est: quid hoc filio Cis? an et Saul in prophetis? ²⁵ quam et mali spiritus postea vertit in alium virum, in apostatam scilicet. Iudam quoque aliquamdiu cum electis deputatum usque ad loculorum officium, etsi iam fraudatorem, traditorem tamen nondum, postea diabolus intravit. 6. Igitur si neque dei neque diaboli spiritus ex nativitate conseritur animae, solam eam constat ante eventum ³⁰ spiritus utriusque; si solam, et simplicem et uniformem substantiae nomine, atque ita non aliunde spirantem quam ex substantiae suae sorte. /

f. 124

9. Jes. 57, 16. 11. Jes. 42, 5. 15. 1 Cor. 15, 46.
17. Eph. 5,31/2. Gen. 2, 23/4. 25. 1 Reg. 10, 11.

1. communionem *A*] conditionem *B Gel* illic de substantia, <hic de actu substantiae> *Kroy. 106* 3. hereticos *A*, ut ubique (sed haereses c. 50,5). nestio *A* 4. sophiae *AB*
collatum *Gel* 5. sui conscia *Gel*] conscientia *A* sui consciam *B*
7. et vivat] et om. *A* 8. declarata differentia *Oehl*] declarat addifferentia
A declarat ad differentias *B* declarans differentias *Gel* in sequentibus]
insequentibus *A* 9. pronuntiant *A* 11. super* *A* 14. calcant *B*
carne *B* 16. postea quod susp. *Kroy. 106* spiritale *A*;
approbat *Kroy. 106*] spiritale est *B Gel* et si *Rfd* 20. agglutinabit
A] adglutinabit *B Gel* mulieri *A*] uxori *B Gel* 21. carnem unam *Rig*
22. vis] sui *A* 23. de * nique *A* 24. alium] malum *A corr.* 26. mali
A; vindicat *Gomperz 65*] malus *B Gel* evertit *B Gel* 27. aliquandiu *A*
adloculorum *A* 28. et, si *Rig*₁₋₂ tamen] tandem *Gel*; lectionem
tamen restituit *Lat, A non inspecto* 29. sed postea *B* 30. eventum]
adventum *Iun*

12. 1. Proinde et animum sive mens est νοῦς apud Graecos, non aliud quid intellegimus quam suggestum animae ingenitum et insitum et nativitas proprium, quo agit, quo sapit, quem secum habens ex semetipsa secum moveat in semetipsa, atque ita moveri
 5 videatur ab illo tamquam substantia alio, ut volunt qui etiam universitatis motatorem animum decernunt, illum deum Socratis, illum Valentini Unigenitum ex patre ΒΥΘΩΙ et matre ΣΙΓΗΙ. 2. Quam Anaxagorae turbata sententia est! Initium enim omnium commentatus animum et universitatis oscillum de illius axe suspendens
 10 purumque eum affirmans et simplicem et incommiscibilem, hoc vel maxime titulo segregat ab animae commixtione et tamen eundem alibi animam edicit. 3. Hoc etiam Aristoteles denotavit, nescio an sua paratior implere quam aliena inanire. Denique et ipse definitionem animi cum differret, interim alterum animi genus pronuntiavit,
 15 illum divinum, quem rursus et impassibilem subostendens abstulit et ipse eum a consortio animae. Cum enim animam passibilem constet eorum quae sortita est pati, aut per animum et cum animo patietur, si concreta est animo, non poterit animus impassibilis induci, aut si non per animum nec cum animo patietur anima, non erit concreta
 20 illi, cum quo nihil et cui nihil patitur. Porro si nihil per illum et cum illo anima patietur, iam nec sentiet nec sapiet nec movebitur per illum, ut volunt. 4. Nam et sensus passiones facit Aristoteles. Quidni? Et sentire enim pati est, quia pati sentire est. Proinde et sapere
 f. 124^v sentire est et moveri sentire est. / Ita totum pati est. Videmus autem
 25 nihil istorum animam experiri, ut non et animo deputetur, quia per illum et cum illo transigatur. 5. Iam ergo et commiscibilis est animus adversus Anaxagoran et passibilis adversus Aristotelen. Ceterum si discretio admittitur, ut substantia duae res sint animus atque anima, alterius erit et passio et sensus et sapor omnis et actus et motus,
 30 alterius autem otium et quies et stupor et nulla iam causa, et aut animus vacabit aut anima. 6. Quodsi constat ambobus haec omnia

1. DE ANIMO A B NON SEPARARI ANIMAM ET ANIMUM Gel
 animus Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,55 virgulam post est ponunt
 Pam Rig Oehl Rfd; quod damnat Kroym. 106 νοῦς] NOYC A
 quod νοῦς Kroym. 106 2. non] quo non A B; Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,56
 quid om. A 3. nativum B (nativitas Bmg) virgulam ante
 proprium ponit Gel 4. secum moveat in semetipsa om. A secum moveat
 Iun] se commoveat B Gel in semet ipsam Rfd; quod damnat Kroym.
 106 5. alio A; vindicat Kroym. 106] alia B Gel 6. mutatorem Bmg
 7. unigenitum A] Monogenen B Gel Monogenem Pam ΒΥΘΩ A βόθω
 B Gel Bytho Rig ΣΥΓΗ Urs] ΣΕΙΓΗNE A κειρήνη B ειρήνη Gel έννοια Pam
 ήρεμια Iun Sige Rig quam A; vindicat Kroym. 106] quamvis B Gel
 8. enim om. A 9. et] ut Seml 10. incommiscibilem B 11. titulos A
 commistione B Gel 12. animam edicit Gel] anima (* A) edicit A B
 animae addicit Rig animae dicit Lindn 13. inanire] damnare B (al. inanire'
 Bmg) 16. et del. Gomperz 65/6 ipse eum] ipsum Rfd ipse, cum Gomperz
 65/6 constat A corr. 17. aut per om. A patiatur A 18. potest
 B Gel 19. nec cum] necum A patiatur A 20. quo Urs] qua A B Gel
 cui A B Gel; vindicant Lindn Th. St. T. 2,45/6] per quem Iun qui Urs
 21. animo Rig 26. transigitur B Gel animae Rig 27. Anaxagoram
 B Gel aristotilen A Aristotelem B Gel 30. quartum et] ita Iun
 mavult 31. vocabit A

reputari, ergo unum erunt utrumque et Democritus obtinebit differentiam tollens et quaeretur, quomodo unum utrumque, ex duarum substantiarum confusione, an ex unius dispositione. Nos autem animum ita dicimus animae concretum, non ut substantia alium, sed ut substantiae officium.

5

13. 1. Ad hoc dispicere superest, principalitas ubi sit, id est, quid cui praeest, ut cuius principalitas apparuerit, illa sit substantiae massa, id autem, cui massa substantiae praeerit, in officium naturale substantiae deputetur. Enimvero quis non animae dabit summam omnem, cuius nomine totius hominis mentio titulata est? 2. Quantas animas pascio, ait dives, non ait animos, et animas salvas optat gubernator, non animos, et rusticus in opere et in proelio miles animam se, non animum, ponere affirmat. Cuius nominatiora pericula aut vota sunt, animi an animae? Quid autem agere dicuntur moribundi, animum an animam? Ipsi postremo philosophi ipsique medici, quamvis de animo quoque disputaturi, faciem tamen operis frontemque materiae de anima unusquisque proscrispsit. 3. Ut autem et a deo discas, animam semper deus alloquitur, animam compellat atque / f. 125 advocat, ut animum sibi advertat. Illam salvam venit facere Christus, illam perdere in gehennam comminatur, illam pluris fieri vetat, illam et ipse bonus pastor pro pecudibus suis ponit. Habes animae principalitatem, habes in illa et substantiae unionem, cuius intellegas instrumentum esse animum, non patrocinium.

14. 1. Singularis alioquin et simplex et de suo tota est, non magis instructilis aliunde quam divisibilis ex se, quia nec dissolubilis. Si enim structilis et dissolubilis, iam non immortalis. Itaque quia non mortalis, neque dissolubilis neque divisibilis. Nam et dividi dissolvi est et dissolvi mori est. 2. Dividitur autem in partes, nunc in duas a Platone, nunc in tres a Zenone, nunc in quinque ab Aristotele et in sex a Panaetio, in septem a Sorano, etiam in octo penes Chrysippum, etiam in novem penes Apollonphanen, sed et in duodecim apud quosdam

19. Luc. 9, 56. 20. Mtth. 10,28. Luc. 14, 26. Joh. 10, 15 (11).

3. *post* dispositione *interrogationis signum ponit Iun* 4. substantiae B Gel 6. despicere A quid] qui B Gel 7. substantia A 8. *prius* massa... in om. A 10. mentiot A 11. *alterum* ait om. B Gel 14. mori *bundum A 15. animam] anima A 16. disputarent B Gel 18. deus semper B Gel compellatque/advocat A 21. animae (ni ex m) principalita *tem A 22. intelligam B Gel 25. instructilis] in se structilis Iun structilis Kroym. 107 26. et dissolubilis; si dissolubilis, iam B Gel quia iam non B Gel 28. dividetur A 29. Zenone] Varrone Pam susp.; del. Iun in quinque ab Aristotele Pam susp.; Diels Dox. Gr. 205; approbant Kroym. 107; A. Schmekel Philos. d. mittl. Stoa 262; R. Hirzel Unters. z. Cic. phil. Schr. 2,772 sqq.; *falsum putat Esser 113*, inquitque A in quinque B Gel a filio Nicomachi in quinque Iun susp. et] aut Esser l. c. 30. panetio A in VII A et in septem B Gel 30. in octo] VIII A 31. novem] VIII A apolphanen A duodecim A Bmg] decem B Gel; approbat Diels Dox. Gr. 206 duodecim et in quindecim K. Reinhardt Poseidonios 355,

Stoicorum, et in duas amplius apud Posidonium, qui a duobus exorsus titulis, principali, quod aiunt ἡγεμονικόν, et a rationali, quod aiunt λογικόν, in decem septem exinde prosequitur; ita aliae ex aliis species dividunt animam. 3. Huiusmodi autem non tam partes animae habebuntur quam vires et efficaciae et operae, sicut de quibusdam et Aristoteles iudicavit. Non enim membra sunt substantiae animalis, sed ingenia, ut motorium, ut actorium, ut cogitatorium, et si qua in hunc modum distinguunt, ut et ipsi illi quinque notissimi sensus, visus auditus gustus tactus odoratus. Quibus omnibus etsi certa singulis domicilia in corpore determinaverunt, non idcirco haec quoque distributio animae ad animae sectiones pertinebit, quando ne ipsum quidem corpus ita dividatur in membra, ut isti volunt animam. 4. Atquin ex multitudine membrorum unum corpus efficitur, f. 125^v ut concretio sit potius / ipsa divisio. Specta portentosissimam Archimedis munificentiam, organum hydraulicum dico, tot membra, tot partes, tot compagine, tot itinera vocum, tot compendia sonorum, tot commercia modorum, tot acies tibiarum, et una moles erunt omnia. Sic et spiritus, qui illic de tormento aquae anhelat, non ideo separabitur in partes, quia per partes administratur, substantia quidem solidus, opera vero divisus. 5. Non longe hoc exemplum est a Stratone et Aenesidemo et Heraclito; nam et ipsi unitatem animae tuentur, quae in totum corpus diffusa et ubique ipsa, velut flatus in calamo per cavernas, ita per sensuality variis modis emicet, non tam concisa quam dispensata. Haec omnia quibus titulis nuncupentur et quibus ex se divisionibus detineantur et quibus in corpore metationibus sequestrentur, medici potius cum philosophis considerabunt; nobis pauca convenient.

15. 1. Inprimis an sit aliqui summus in anima gradus vitalis et sapientialis, quod ἡγεμονικόν appellant, id est principale, quia si negetur, totus animae status periclitatur. Denique qui negant prin-

1. qui aduobus A quia duobus B 2. tituli A hegemonicon A a rationali] irrationali susp. Stein l. c. 189_{agg}; Esser l. c. 3. λογικόν] ελογον susp. Stein l. c.; Esser l. c.; voces et irrationali, quod aiunt ελογον ante et a rationali per haplographiam intercidiisse putat R. Philippson, Rh. Mus. N. S. 78 (1929), 359 λογικόν in om. A lacuna relicta decem septem A] decem et septem B Gel decem Iun duodecim Pam; approbant Stein l. c. 189; Diels Dox. Graeci 206; Philippson l. c. decem et quattuor Rfd susp.; lectionem traditam vindicat K. Schindler, Die stoische Lehre von den Seelenteilen und Seelenvermögen, etc. 59/61 aliae A; approbat Th. St. T. 1,40] in alias B Gel species A ut ubique, exc. c. 10,9 et 32,3 7. actorium] altorium (= ὁρετικόν) susp. La Cerda 8. distinguunt A distinguuntur Iun ut delet Iun in quinque Gel; dubitat Iun novissimi A 12. corpus ita dividatur] corpus ita dividatur A 14. portentosissimam A 15. hydrolicum Rig₂ primum tot] toth A corr. 17. commertia A 21. est om. A; damnat Hoppe Beitr. 45, * ipsi A 22. defusa A 25. detineantur A Bmg] deriventur B Gel distineantur Kroym. 107 26. cum philosophis] tum philosophi Gel 28. DE HE * MOGENICON A DE HEGEMONICO B DE HEGEMONICO AN SIT ET UBI SIT Gel aliqui A] aliquis B Gel 29. egemonicon A quia om. A 30. anima/estatus A periclitetur A; quod lapsus calami putat Hoppe Beitr. 36,

cipale, ipsam prius animam nihil censuerunt. 2. Messenius aliqui
 Dicaearchus, ex medicis autem Andreas et Asclepiades ita abstulerunt
 principale, dum in animo ipso volunt esse sensus, quorum vindicatur
 principale. Asclepiades etiam illa argumentatione vectatur, quod
 pleraque animalia adeptis eis partibus corporis, in quibus plurimum
 existimatur principale consistere, et insuper vivant aliquatenus et
 sapiant nihilominus, / ut muscae et vespae et lucustae, si capita f. 126
 decideris, ut caprae et testudines et anguillae, si corda detraxeris;
 itaque principale non esse, quo, si fuisset, amisso cum suis sedibus
 vigor animae non perseveraret. 3. Sed plures et philosophi adversus 10
 Dicaearchum, Plato Strato Epicurus Democritus Empedocles Socrates
 Aristoteles, et medici adversus Andream et Asclepiaden, Herophilus
 Erasistratus Diocles Hippocrates et ipse Soranus, iamque omnibus
 plures Christiani, qui apud deum de utroque deducimur, et esse
 principale in anima et certo in corporis recessu consecratum. 4. Si 15
 enim scrutatorem et dispectorem cordis deum
 legimus, si etiam propheta eius occulta cordis traducendo probatur,
 si deus ipse recogitatus cordis in populo praevenit: quid cogi-
 tatis in cordibus vestris nequam? si et David:
 cor mundum conde in me deus, et Paulus corde 20
 ait credi in iustitiam, et Iohannes corde ait suo
 unumquemque reprehendi, si postremo qui viderit
 feminam ad concupiscendum, iam adulteravit
 in corde, simul utrumque dilucet, et esse principale in anima,
 quod intentio divina conveniat, id est vim sapientialem atque vitalem 25
 (quod enim sapit, vividum est), et in eo thesauro corporis haberi,
 ad quem deus respicit, 5. ut neque extrinsecus agitari putes principale
 istud secundum Heraclitum, neque per totum corpus ventilari secun-
 dum Moschionem, neque in capite concludi secundum Platonem,
 neque in vertice potius praesidere secundum Xenocraten, neque in 30
 cerebro cubare secundum Hippocraten, sed nec circa cerebri funda-
 mentum, ut Herophilus, nec in membranulis, ut Strato et Erasistratus,
 nec in superciliorum meditullio, ut Strato Physicus, nec in tota lorica
 pectoris, ut Epicurus, sed quod et Aegyptii renuntiaverunt

16. Sap. 1, 6. 17. Prov. 24, 12. 18. Mtth. 9, 4. 20. Ps. 50, 12.
 Rom. 10, 10. 21. Ioh. 3, 20. 22. Mtth. 5, 28.

1. aliqui A] aliquis B Gel 2. abstulerint A corr. 6. aliqua-
 tinus A 7. locustae B Gel 9. quo Kroy. 107 Gom-
 perz 2; approbat Blf. Mus. 41 (1934), 312] quod A B Gel amisso
 A] amissus B Gel sedibus om. A 10. adverdi cē arcum A
 11. Socrates] Xenocrates Diels Dox. Gr. 204 12. Andream B Gel
 Asclepiadem B Gel 13. herasistratus A ipocrates A
 14. ducimur A docemur Mercerus deducimus Iun 16. despectorem A
 18. deus] dominus A 19. si] sic B Gel 25. quod] quo A 26. sapit]
 rapit Bmg thensauro A 27. ad quem] atque A 28. neque] nec A
 29. Moschionem Bmg] Moschionem A Moschionem B Muschionem Seml
 32. herophilo A membranulis A corr. membranula eius Iun susp.
 Strato et secl. Diels Dox. Gr. 204 34. sed * quod Rfd putans voces
 in corde habere sedem intercidisse; etiam Kroy. 107 lacunam signat
 sed quod et] sed et quod Pam secundum quod et Hartel ap. Rfd (Patr.
 Stud. 4, 57 lectionem traditam vindicans) renunciaverunt A

- f. 126^v et qui divinarum / commentatores videbantur, ut et ille versus Orphei vel Empedoclis: namque homini sanguis circumcordialis est sensus. 6. Etiam Protagoras, etiam Apollodoros et Chrysippus haec sapiunt, ut vel ab istis retusus Asclepiades capras
5 suas quaerat sine corde balantes et muscas suas abigat sine capite volitantes, et omnes iam sciant se potius sine corde et cerebro vivere, qui dispositionem animae humanae de condicione bestiarum praeiudicarint.

16. 1. Est et illud ad fidem pertinens, quod Plato bifariam partitur
10 animam, per rationale et irrationale. Cui definitioni et nos quidem applaudimus, sed non ut naturae deputetur utrumque. Naturale enim rationale credendum est, quod animae a primordio sit ingenitum, a rationali videlicet auctore. Quid enim non rationale, quod deus iussu quoque ediderit, nedum id quod proprie afflatu suo emiserit?
15 Irrationale autem posterius intellegendum est, ut quod acciderit ex serpentis instinctu, ipsum illud transgressionis admissum, atque exinde inoleverit et coadoleverit in anima ad instar iam naturalitatis, quia statim in naturae primordio accidit. 2. Ceterum cum idem Plato solum rationale dicat, ut in anima dei ipsius, si nos etiam
20 irrationale naturae adscribimus, quam a deo anima nostra sortita est, aequè irrationale de deo erit, utpote naturale, quia naturae deus auctor est. Sed enim a diabolo immissio delicti, irrationale autem omne delictum; igitur a diabolo irrationale, a quo et delictum, extraneum a deo, a quo est irrationale alienum. Proinde delicti diversitas
25 horum ex distantia auctorum. 3. Proinde cum Plato soli deo segregans rationale duo genera subdividit ex irrationali, indignativum, quod
f. 127 appellant θυμικόν, et concupiscentivum, / quod vocant ἐπιθυμητικόν, ut illud quidem commune sit nobis et leonibus, istud vero cum muscis, rationale porro cum deo, video et de hoc mihi esse retractandum
30 propter ea quae in Christo deprehenduntur. 4. Ecce enim tota haec trinitas et in domino: et rationale, quo docet, quo disserit, quo salutis

1. et] ei B Gel; La Cerda susp. (sc. Mercurio Trismegisto') ii Urs ut Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,57 divinarum Iun divinarum litterarum Rfd; contra quem disputat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,57 divinarum rerum Kroym. 108 commemoratores A Bmg; vindicat Kroym. 107 alii contemptores, quod mendum puto' La Cerda commentator esse videbatur La Cerda susp. ut om. Gel orphaei A
2. empedoclis A corr. hominis B Gel 3. est] 'st Iun Protagoras] Praxagoras Pam susp. Pythagoras La Cerda et Diels Dox. Gr. 204 apollo durus A Apollo Horus La Cerda susp. 4. haec] hac A hoc Iun sapiant Iun 7. humanae de om. A conditione A
10. rationalem et irrationalem B Gel 11. adplaudimus B Gel 13. quid enim? non Iun 14. * ediderit A propriae A 17. et coadoleverit om. A 19. ut delere vult Rfd 20. adscripserimus B Gel 21. est] st A quia naturae om. A 24. proinde del. Iun delicti A B] om. Gel licuit Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,58; post delicti lacunam signat Rfd 25. Proinde] deinde Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,58 26. irrationali] rationali ex rationale A rationali Rig 27. thymicon A ΕΠΙΘΥΜΗΤΙΚΟΝ A
28. * illud A 31. alterum et om. A quo disserit Iun] quae disserit A B Gel

vias sternit, et indignativum, quo invehitur in scribas et Phariseos, et concupiscentivum, quo pascha cum discipulis suis edere concupiscit. 5. Igitur apud nos non semper ex irrationali censenda sunt indignativum et concupiscentivum, quae certi sumus in domino rationaliter decucurrisse. Indignabitur deus rationaliter, quibus scilicet debet, et concupiscet deus rationaliter, quae digna sunt ipso. Nam et malo indignabitur et bono concupiscet salutem. 6. Dat et apostolus nobis concupiscentiam: si quis episcopatum concupiscit, bonum opus concupiscit; et bonum opus dicens rationalem concupiscentiam ostendit. Concedit et indignationem. Quidni, quam et ipse susceperit? Utinam et praecedantur, inquit, qui vos subvertunt. Rationalis et indignatio quae ex affectu disciplinae est. 7. At cum dicit: fuimus aliquando natura filii irae, irrationale indignativum suggillat, quod non sit ex ea natura quae a deo est, sed ex illa quam diabolus induxit, dominus et ipse dictus sui ordinis: non potestis duobus dominis servire, pater et ipse cognominatus: vos ex diabolo patre estis, ne timeas et illi proprietatem naturae alterius adscribere posterioris et adulterae, quem legis avenarum superseminatorem / et frumentariae segetis nocturnum interpolatorem. 20 f. 127^v

17. 1. Contingit nos illorum etiam quinque sensuum quaestio, quos in primis litteris discimus, quoniam et hinc aliquid haereticis procuratur. Visus est et auditus et odoratus et gustus et tactus. 2. Horum fidem Academici durius damnant, secundum quosdam et Heraclitus et Diocles et Empedocles, certe Plato in Timaeo irrationalem pronuntians sensualitatem et opinioni coimplicitam. Itaque mendacium visui obicitur, quod remos in aqua inflexos vel infractos adseverat adversus conscientiam integritatis, quod turrem quadrangulatam de longinquo rotundam persuadeat, quod aequalissimam porticum angustiolem in ultimo infamet, quod caelum tanta sublimitate suspensum mari iungat. 3. Perinde auditus fallaciae reus, ut cum caeleste murmur putamus et plaustrum est, vel tonitru meditante pro certo de plastro credimus sonitum. Sic et odoratus et gustus arguuntur, siquidem eadem unguenta eademque vina posteriore quoque usu depretiantur. Sic et tactus reprehenditur, siquidem

8. 1 Tim. 3, 1. 11. Gal. 5, 12. 13. Eph. 2, 3. 16. Mtth. 6, 24.
17. Joh. 8, 44. 19. Mtth. 13, 25.

4. certi sumus] cer tissimus A dñm A 9. sed bonum B Gel 10. et om. A 12. est indignatio B Gel 14. suggilat A 15. quam] qua Iun 19. et/et adulterae A 20. superseminatarum Rig. 22. DE QUINQUE SENSIBUS A B Gel Contingit Pam] contigit A B Gel 25. virgulam post voces secundum quosdam ponunt A B Gel; recte primus distinxit Pam 26. Heraclitus et Diocles] Heraclides Iun susp. P. lato A timeo A 27. pronuntiat B Gel pronuntiat Pam complicitam B Gel 31. infamet] informet (ὁπορευώρη) Iun susp. 32. proinde Bmg fallacia A 33. mugitante O. Hey, A. L. L. 11, 270 34. pro certo] procella Lindn susp. 36. quoque] quaeque Rfd susp.; quem refulat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4, 58 depraetiantur A

eadem pavimenta manibus asperiora, pedibus leviora creduntur, et in lavacris idem calidae lacus ferventissimus primo, dehinc temperatissimus renuntiatur. 4. Adeo, inquiunt, sic quoque fallimur sensibus, dum sententias vertimus. Moderantius Stoici non omnem sensum, 5 nec semper, de mendacio onerant. Epicurei constantius parem omnibus f. 128 atque perpetuam defendunt veritatem, / sed alia via. Non enim sensum mentiri, sed opinionem. Sensum enim pati, non opinari; animam enim opinari. Absciderunt et opinionem a sensu et sensum ab anima. 5. Et unde opinio, si non a sensu? Denique nisi visus rotundam senserit 10 turrem, nulla opinio rotunditatis. Et unde sensus, si non ab anima? Denique carens anima corpus carebit et sensu. Ita et sensus ex anima est et opinio ex sensu et anima totum. Ceterum optime proponetur esse utique aliquid quod efficiat aliter quid a sensibus renuntiari quam sit in rebus. Porro si potest id renuntiari quod non sit in rebus, cur 15 non perinde possit per id renuntiari quod non sit in sensibus, sed in eis rationibus quae interveniant suo nomine? 6. Atque adeo licebit eas recognosci. Nam ut in aqua remus inflexus vel infractus appareat, aqua in causa est; denique extra aquam integer visui remus. Teneritas autem substantiae illius, qua speculum ex lumine efficitur, prout 20 icta seu mota est, ita et imaginem vibrans evertit lineam recti. Item ut turris habitus eludat, intervalli condicio compellit in aperto; aequalitas enim circumfusi aeris pari luce vestiens angulos obliterat lineas. Sic et uniformitas porticus acuitur in fine, dum acies in concluso stipata illic tenuatur, quo et extenditur. Sic et caelum mari unitur, 25 ubi visio absimitur, quae quamdiu viget, tamdiu dividit. 7. Auditum vero quid aliud decipiet quam sonorum similitudo? Et si postea minus spirat unguentum et minus sapit vinum et minus lacus fervet, in omnibus ferme prima vis tota est. Ceterum de scabro ac levi merito f. 128^v manus ac pedes tenera scilicet et callosa membra dissentiant. / 8. Igitur 30 hoc modo nulla sensuum frustratio causa carebit. Quodsi causae fallunt sensus et per sensus opiniones, iam nec in sensibus constituenda fallacia est, qui causas sequuntur, nec in opinionibus, quae a sensibus diriguntur sequentibus causas. 9. Qui insaniunt, alios in aliis vident, ut Orestes matrem in sorore et Ajax Ulixen in armento, ut Athamas 35 et Agaue in filiis bestias. Oculisne hoc mendacium exprobrabis, an furiis? Qui redundantia fellis auruginant, amara sunt omnia. Num ergo gustui praevaricationem exprobrabis, an valetudini? Omnes itaque sensus evertuntur vel circumveniuntur ad tempus, ut proprietate fallaciae careant. 10. Immo iam ne ipsis quidem causis adscribendum 40 est fallaciae elogium. Si enim ratione haec accidunt, ratio fallacia perhiberi non meretur. Quod sic fieri oportet, mendacium non est.

2. calidus *B Gel* 7. sensum] sedsum *A* animam enim opinari]
animam opinari *Iun* animam enim non opinari *Rig* 8. sensu] sensus *A*
et sensum ab anima *om. A* 10. rotunditatis *A corr.* 13. alter *A corr.*
16. eis *A*] his *B Gel* 21. conditio *A* 22. Aequalitas *ex* aequalitas *A*
24. illic] illuc *Hartel ap. Rfd* 26. quia] aliud *A* 28. totum *Iun*
32. secuntur *A* in *om. B* 34. Ulyssem *B* Ulixem *Gel*
36. Iis qui *Gomperz 66; quem refutat Hoppe Beitr. 111* mara
A corr. m. rec. 37. valetudine *A corr.* valetudinem *B Gel* 40. fallaciae]
fallacie *A* ellogium *Iun* fallacia] fallaciae *B* (fallacia *Bmg*)

Itaque si et ipsae causae infamia liberantur, quanto magis sensus, quibus iam et causae libere praeceunt, cum hinc potissimum et veritas et fides et integritas sensibus vindicanda sit, quod non aliter renuntiant quam quod illa ratio mandavit, quae efficiat aliter quid a sensibus renuntiari quam sit in rebus! 11. Quid agis, Academia procacissima? 5 Totum vitae statum evertis, omnem naturae ordinem turbas, ipsius dei providentiam excaecas, qui cunctis operibus suis intellegendis incolendis dispensandis fruendisque fallaces et mendaces dominos praefecerit sensus. An non istis universa conditio subministratur? An non per istos secunda quoque mundo instructio accessit, tot artes, 10 tot ingenia, tot studia negotia officia commercia / remedia consilia f. 129 solacia victus cultus ornatus, quae omnia totum vitae saporem condierunt, dum per hos sensus solus omnium homo animal rationale dinoscitur intelligentiae et scientiae capax, et ipsius Academiae? 12. Sed enim Plato, ne quod testimonium sensibus signet, propterea 15 et in Phaedro ex Socratis persona negat se cognoscere posse semetipsum, ut monet Delphica inscriptio, et in Theaeteto adimit sibi scire atque sentire et in Phaedro post mortem differt sententiam veritatis, postumam scilicet; et tamen nondum mortuus philosophabatur. 13. Non licet, non licet nobis in dubium sensus istos devocare, ne et 20 in Christo de fide eorum deliberetur, ne forte dicatur quod falso satanan prospectarit de caelo praecipitatum aut falso vocem patris audierit de ipso testificatam aut deceptus sit, cum Petri socrum tetigit, aut alium postea unguenti senserit spiritum, quod in sepul- turam suam acceptavit, alium postea vini saporem, quod in sanguinis 25 sui memoriam consecravit. 14. Sic enim et Marcion phantasma eum maluit credere, totius corporis in illo dedignatus veritatem. Atquin ne in apostolis quidem eius ludificata natura est; fidelis fuit et visus et auditus in monte, fidelis et gustus vini illius, licet aquae ante, in nuptiis Galilaeae, fidelis et tactus exinde creduli Thomae. Recita 30 Johannis testationem: quod vidimus, inquit, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostrae contrectaverunt de sermone vitae. Falsa

22. Luc. 10, 18. Mtth. 3, 17. 23. Mtth. 8, 15. 24. Mtth. 26, 7/12.
25. Luc. 22, 20 (Mtth. 26, 27/9). 28. Mtth. 17, 3 seqq. 29. Joh. 2, 1 seqq.
30. Joh. 20, 27. 31. 1 Joh. 1, 1.

2. post praeceunt interrogationis signum ponit Iun 4. quod delet Oehl quit A 5. quam sit] quod sit B Academice procacissime B Gel 8. colendis Rfd 9. condicio A 12. ornatus, quae omnia Hartel ap. Rfd] ornatusque. Omnia A ornatusque, omnia B ornatusque: omnia Gel ornatusque? omnia Rig₁ ornatusque omnia? Rig₂ ornatusque, omnia? Rfd ornatus? Quae omnia Hartel Patr. Stud. 4, 59 13. hos] os A corr. sensibus A corr. 14. dignoscitur Rig et scientiae om. A 17. in te aehtbeto (h prius inductum) A 18. et om. A sententiam] scientiam Hartel Patr. Stud. 4, 59 virgulam ante veritatis ponunt Rig Oehl Rfd 19. postumam Gel mortuis Bmg 20. non licet semel exhibent B Gel; cf. Lfst. Spr. Tert. 74 revocare B Gel 21. delibretur Iun 22. Sathanam B Satanam Gel 23. testificatum A Lindn 24. *spiritum A 26. *memoriam A 30. galilee A

utique testatio, si oculorum et aurium et manuum sensus natura mentitur.

- f. 129^v 18. / 1. Convertor ad intellectualium partem, quemadmodum illam Plato a corporalibus separatam haereticis commendaverit agnitionem ante mortem consecutus. Ait enim in Phaedone: Quid tum erga ipsam prudentiae possessionem? Utrumne impedimentum erit corpus, an non, si quis illud socium assumpserit in quaestionem? Tale quid dico: habetne veritatem aliquam visio et auditio hominibus? An non etiam poetae haec nobis semper obmussant, quod neque audiamus certum neque videamus? Meminerat scilicet et Epicharmi Comici: animus cernit, animus audit, reliqua surda et caeca sunt. 2. Itaque rursus illum ergo ait supersapere qui mente maxime sapiat, neque visionem proponens neque ullum eiusmodi sensum attrahens animo, sed ipsa mente sincera utens in recogitando ad capiendum sincerum quodque rerum, si egressus potissimum ab oculis et auribus et, quod dicendum sit, a toto corpore ut turbante et non permittente animae possidere veritatem atque prudentiam, quando communicat. 3. Videmus igitur adversus sensus corporales aliam portendi paraturam ut multo idoniorum, vires scilicet animae, intellectum operantes eius veritatis, cuius res non sint coram nec subiaceant corporalibus sensibus, sed absint longe a communi conscientia in arcano et in superioribus et apud ipsum deum. Vult enim Plato esse quasdam substantias invisibiles incorporales supermundiales, divinas et aeternas, quas appellat ideas, id est formas, exempla et causas naturalium istorum manifestorum et subiacentium corporalibus sensibus, et illas quidem esse veritates, haec autem imagines earum. 4. Relucentne iam haeretica semina Gnosticorum et Valentinianorum? Hinc enim / arripiunt differentiam corporalium sensuum et intellectualium virium, quam etiam parabola decem virginum adtemperant, ut quinque stultae sensus corporales figuraverint, stultos videlicet, quia deceptui faciles, sapientes autem intellectualium virium notam expresserint, sapientium scilicet, quia contingentium veritatem illam arcanam et supernam et apud pleroma constitutam, haereticarum idearum sacramenta; hoc enim sunt et aeones et genealogiae illorum. 5. Itaque et sensum

5. Plato Phaedo 65 A seq.

11. Plato Phaedo 65 E seq.

3. DE INTELLECTUALIBUS A B QUOD PHILOSOPHI ET HAERETICI DISTINGUANT INTER SENSUALIA ET INTELLECTUALIA Gel 4. a add. A m. rec. 5. Phaedone Pam] phado A Phaetro B Gel quid tum? possessionem utrumne... quaestionem? Iun distinguit 7. adumpserit B Gel 8. ? An non etiam scripsi] An non? an etiam A an non? an non etiam B Gel 13. ullum] illum Bmg eiusmodi] aliusmodi Iun sensum Bmg] om. A B Gel animo Bmg] animum A B 14. rogitando A 15. si egressus] segressus Rig quod] quo Gel 18. uti ex ut A aut B 19. idoneiorem Iun 21. sconscientia A corr. 23. incorporales supermundiales om. A 24. exemplares B Gel 30. quia] qui Rig₃ 31. expraesserint A 33. Dearum A (corr. m. rec.) dearum Bmg Idaearum Pam, ut semper 34. αἰῶνες B Gel

dividunt et intellectualibus quidem a spiritali suo semine, sensualibus vero ab animali, quia spiritalia nullo modo capiat; et illius quidem esse invisibilia, huius vero visibilia et humilia et temporalia, quae sensu convenientur in imaginibus constituta. Ob haec ergo praestruximus neque animum aliud quid esse quam animae suggestum et structum, neque spiritum extraneum quid quam quod et ipsa per flatum, ceterum accessioni deputandum quod aut deus postea aut diabolus adspiraret. 6. Et nunc ad differentiam sensualium et intellectualium non aliud admittimus quam rerum diversitates, corporalium et spiritalium, visibilium et invisibilium, publicatarum et arcanarum, 10 quod illae sensui, istae intellectui attribuantur, apud animam tamen et istis et illis obsequio deputatis, quae perinde per corpus corporalia sentiat, quemadmodum per animum incorporea intellegat, salvo eo, ut etiam sentiat, dum intellegit. 7. Non enim et sentire intellegere est et intellegere sentire est? / Aut quid erit sensus, nisi eius rei 15 f. 130^v quae sentitur intellectus? Quid erit intellectus, nisi eius rei quae intellegitur sensus? Unde ista tormenta cruciandae simplicitatis et suspendendae veritatis? Quis mihi exhibebit sensum non intellegentem quod sentit aut intellectum non sentientem quod intellegit, ut probet alterum sine altero posse? 8. Si corporalia quidem sentiuntur, incor-²⁰ poralia vero intelleguntur, rerum genera diversa sunt, non domicilia sensus et intellectus, id est, non anima et animus. Denique a quo sentiuntur corporalia? Si ab animo, ergo iam et sensualis est animus, non tantum intellectualis, nam dum intellegit, sentit, quia si non sentit, nec intellegit; si vero ab anima corporalia sentiuntur, iam 25 ergo et intellectualis est vis animae, non tantum sensualis, nam dum sentit, intellegit, quia si non intellegit, nec sentit. Proinde a quo intelleguntur incorporea? Si ab animo, ubi erit anima? Si ab anima, ubi erit animus? Quae enim distant, abesse invicem debent, cum suis muneribus operantur. 9. Putabis quidem abesse animum ab 30 anima, si quando, nam ita effici, ut nesciamus vidisse quid vel audisse, quia alibi fuerit animus. Adeo contendam immo ipsam animam nec vidisse nec audisse, quia alibi fuerit cum sua vi, id est animo. Nam et cum dementit homo, anima dementit non peregrinante, sed con-

1. et intellectualibus] intellectualibus *Iun* ex intellectualibus *Rfd* et in intellectualibus *Hartel ap. Rfd*; qui *Patr. Stud. 4,60* inter hanc coniecturam et lectionem traditam dubitat 4. prestruximus *A* 6. quidquam *A* (d add. m. rec.) 8. adspirarit *Rig. in Erratis* adspirarat *Rig.* 11. aput *A* 12. obsequio *om. A* (quod approbat *Kroym. 108*); uncinis inclusit *B* 13. salvo . . . sentiat] salvo eo, ut etiam <intellegat, dum sentit, etiam> sentiat *Kroym. 108* 15. sentire est?] non sentire est *Urs* Aut] at *B Gel* 18. suspendae *A* 20. sine *Bmg*] ex *A B* (approbat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,60*) excluso *Rfd susp.* 23. animo] anima *Gel* 24. intellectuaris *A* quia si] quasi *B* quia si . . . intellegit] *om. A*; uncinis inclusit *B* (al. desunt' *Bmg*) 26. et *om. A* intellectualis] intellectus *Gel* 27. perinde *Rfd* 31. si quando. Nam ita effici *Oehl*; approbat *Kroym. 108*] si quando. Nam ita efficiunt *A B Gel* si quando animo ita afficimur *Urs* aliquando? Nam ita efficiunt *Lindn* ut *om. A* 31. vidisse *A*] nos vidisse *B Gel*; cf. *Lfst Spr. Tert. 53* 32. quia *Urs*] nec audisse, quia *A B* nec non audisse, quia *Gel* animus . . . 33. fuerit *om. A* Adeo] ideo *Iun susp.* 34. dementit anima *B Gel*

patiente tunc animo — ceterum animae principaliter casus est. 10. Hoc unde firmatur? Quod anima digressa nec animus in homine inveniatur; ita illam ubique sequitur, a qua nec in fine subremanet. Cum vero sequitur et addicitur, perinde intellectus animae addicitur quam
 f. 131 5 sequitur animus, cui addicitur / intellectus. Sit nunc et potior sensu intellectus et potior cognitor sacramentorum, dummodo et ipse propria vis animae, quod et sensus. Nihil mea interest, nisi cum idcirco praefertur sensui intellectus, ut ex hoc quoque separatio habeatur quo potior affirmatur. Tunc mihi post differentiam etiam
 10 praelatio retundenda est perventura quoque usque ad potioris dei persuasionem. 11. Sed de deo suo quoque campo experiemur cum haereticis. Nunc de anima titulus et de intellectu non insidiosae praefendo locus. Nam etsi potiora sunt quae intellectu attinguntur ut spiritalia quam quae sensu ut corporalia, rerum erit praelatio,
 15 sublimiorum scilicet adversus humiliores, non intellectus adversus sensum. Quomodo enim praefertur sensui intellectus, a quo informatur ad cognitionem veritatum? 12. Si enim veritates per imagines apprehenduntur, id est invisibilia per visibilia noscuntur, quia et apostolus nobis scribit: invisibilia enim eius a con-
 20 ditione mundi de factitamentis intellecta visuntur, et Plato haereticis: facies occultorum ea quae apparent, et: necesse est omnino hunc mundum imaginem quandam esse alterius alicuius, ecquid tibi videtur intellectus duce uti sensu et auctore et principali
 25 fundamento nec sine illo veritates posse contingi? Quomodo ergo potior erit eo per quem est, quo eget, cui debet totum quod attingit? 13. Ita utrumque concluditur, neque praefendum sensui intellectum (per quod enim quid constat, inferius ipso est) neque separandum a sensu (per quod enim quid est, cum ipso est).

f. 131^v 30 19. / 1. Sed ne illi quidem praetereundi qui vel modico temporis viduant animam intellectu. Proinde enim viam sternunt postea inducendi eius, sicut et animi, a quo scilicet proveniat intellectus. 2. Volunt infantiam sola anima contineri, qua tantummodo vivat, non ut pariter sapiat, quia nec omnia sapiant quae vivant. Denique

19. Rom. 1, 20. 21. cf. comm.

2. unde] inde Urs 3. nec] neque (que inductum) A 4. sequitur om. A; post hanc vocem virgulam ponit Rfd proinde Rfd
 posterius addicitur] adicitur A 5. sensui A B 6. prius et] ut Harlel Patr. Stud. 4,60 7. mea] in ea Bmg 9. patior A 10. praelatio retundenda B perventuro Rig; quod damnat Th. St. T. 1,41
 quoque om. A; vindicat Th. St. T. 1,41 12. alterum de om. Gel praefendo] praetereundus Rfd susp.; quem refutat Harlel Patr. Stud. 4,60
 22. et: necesse est Lindn distinguit est] esse Gel 24. ecquid tibi videtur Kroym. 108] videtur A et quid sibi videtur B et quod sibi videtur Gel
 equidem ibi videtur Oehl ecquid ibi? videtur Lindn ecquid ibi videtur Rfd; quod approbat Hoppe Gnomon 11 (1935), 253 28. quod Kroym. 109] quem A B Gel quid] (inquit) B 30. INTELLECTUM SEMPER (SEMPER om. A) ANIMAE INESSE A B Gel 31. Proinde] perinde Rfd
 32. et animi a quo Rig] et animi ma quo A et anima quo B in anima Gel

arbores vivere nec tamen sapere secundum Aristotelen et si quis alius substantiam animalem in universa communicat, quae apud nos in homine privata res est, non modo ut dei opus, quod et cetera, sed ut dei flatu, quod haec sola, quam dicimus cum omni instructu suo nasci. 3. Et si ad arbores provocamur, amplectemur exemplum, siquidem et illis necdum arbusculis, sed stipitibus adhuc et surculis etiamnunc, simul de scrobibus oriuntur, inest propria vis animae. Verum pro temporis ratione remoratur coalescens et coadulescens robori suo, donec aetas adimpleat habitum, quo natura fungatur. Aut unde mox illis et frutices inoculantur et folia formantur et germina inflantur et flosculi inornantur et succi condiuntur, si non in ipsis omnis paratura generis quiescit et partibus promota grandescit? 4. Inde igitur et sapiunt unde vivunt, tam vivendi quam sapiendi proprietate, et quidem ab infantia et ipsae sua. Video enim et vitem adhuc teneram et inpuerem intelligentem tamen iam opera sua et volentem alicui adhaerere, cui innixa et innexa proficiat. Denique non expectata rustica disciplina, sine arundine, sine cervo, si quid attigerit, ultro amabit, / et quidem viriosius amplexabitur de suo ingenio quam de tuo arbitrio. Properat esse secura. 5. Video et hederas, quantum velis premas, statim ad superna conari et nullo praeceunte suspendi, quod malint parietibus invehi textili silva quam humi teri voluntaria iniuria. Contra quibus de aedificio male est, ut crescendo recedunt, ut refugiant? Sentias ramos aliorum destinatos, et animationem arboris de divortio parietis intellegas. Contenta est parvitate quam ex primordio providentissimi fruticis edidit, timens etiam ruinam. 6. Has ego sapientias et scientias arborum cur non contendam? Vivant ut philosophi volunt, sapiant ut philosophi nolunt; intellegat et infantia ligni, quo magis hominis? cuius anima velut surculus quidam ex matrice Adam in propaginem deducta et genitalibus feminae foveis commendata cum omni sua paratura pullulavit tam intellectu quam et sensu. 7. Mentior, si non statim infans, ut vitam vagitu salutavit, hoc ipsum se testatur sensisse atque intellexisse quod natus est, omnes simul ibidem dedicans sensus, et luce visum

4. quod] quo *Rfd susp.*; contra disputat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,61*
 5. nasci] nascitur *Rfd susp.*; refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,61* 7. etiamnunc
A corr. 9. impleat *A* 10. fru * tices *A* 11. suci *Oehl Rfd*
 14. proprietate *A* ipsa *Kroym. 109* 16. alicubi *Gel* cui *A]*
 cum *B Gel* innixa] nixa *A corr.* innisa *Lat* 17. cervo *A Bmg]* orno *B*
 corno *Pam geruo (vel cervo) Iun susp.* si quod *Lat* 18. ambibit *Lat*
 amplexabitur *om. A* 19. punctum post arbitrio primus posuit *Rig*
 ederas *A* 20. primas *A* 21. mali in parietibus *A corr.* 23. refugiant?
 Sentias *Urs]* refugium sentias *A B Gel Lindn* qui hoc modo distinguit: ut ...
 sentias, ramos ... intellegas! ramis *Iun* destinatum *Gel* destinatis
Iun aliorum tendere aliorum destinatos *Rfd susp.* tendere (vel
 refugere: *Patr. Stud. 4,61*) mente addendum censet *Hartel ap. Rfd*
 24. devortio *Iun* Contenta est *Rig]* contentia est *A Bmg* contenta
 sunt *B* contentae sua *Gel* contenta sua est *Oehl* contenta *Lindn*
 parvitate *B* (parvitate *Bmg*), quod approbat *Kellner 318*, 25. edidit
Gel] sedidit *A* Se didicit *B* se diducit *Lindn* timentis etiam *Lat* timentis
 iam *Rfd susp.* 27. sapiant ... nolunt *om. A* intellegat et infantia
Urs] intellegant et infantiam *A B Gel* 30. pullulabit *B (-vit Bmg) Gel*
 32. tet statur *A*

et sono auditum et umore gustum et aere odoratum et terra tactum. Ita prima illa vox de primis sensuum motibus et de primis intellectuum pulsibus cogitur. 8. Plus est quod de prospectu lacrimabilis vitae quidam augerem incommodorum vocem illam flebilem interpretantur, 5 quod etiam praesciens habenda sit ab ingressu nativitatis, nedum intellegens. Exinde et matrem spiritu probat et nutricem spiritu examinat et gerulam spiritu agnoscit, fugiens extranea ubera et f. 132^v recusans ignota cubilia /, neminem appetens nisi ex usu. 9. Unde illi iudicium novitatis et moris, si non sapit? Unde illi et offendi 10 et demulceri, si non intellegit? Mirum satis, ut infantia naturaliter animosa sit non habens animum et naturaliter affectiosa sit non habens intellectum. At enim Christus ex ore lactantium et parvulorum experiendo laudem nec pueritiam nec infantiam hebetes pronuntiavit, quarum altera cum suffragio occurrens testimonium ei potuit offerre, 15 altera pro ipso trucidata utique vim sensit.

20. 1. Et hic itaque concludimus omnia naturalia animae ut substantiva eius ipsi inesse et cum ipsa procedere atque proficere, ex quo ipsa censetur. Sicut et Seneca saepe noster: insita sunt nobis omnium artium et aetatum semina, magisterque ex occulto deus producit ingenia, 20 ex seminibus scilicet insitis et occultis per infantiam, quae sunt et intellectus. Ex his enim producuntur ingenia. 2. Porro et frugum seminibus una generis cuiusque forma est, processus tamen varii: alia integro statu evadunt, alia etiam meliora respondent, alia degenerant pro condicione caeli et soli, pro ratione operis et curae, pro 25 temporum eventu, pro licentia casuum; ita et animam licebit semine uniformem, fetu multiformem. Nam et hic etiam de locis interest. 3. Thebis hebetes et brutos nasci relatum est, Athenis sapiendi dicendique acutissimos, ubi penes Colyttum pueri mense citius 30 eloquuntur praecoca lingua, siquidem et Plato in Timaeo Minervam affirmat, cum urbem illam moliretur, nihil aliud quam regionis f. 133 naturam prospexisse talia ingenia pollicitam; unde et ipse / in Legibus Megillo et Cliniae praecipit condendae civitati locum procurare. Sed Empedocles causam argutae indolis et obtusae in sanguinis qualitate 35 constituit, perfectum ac profectum de doctrina disciplinaque deducit. Tamen vulgata iam res est gentilium proprietatum. Comici Phrygas

18. Ben. 4, 6, 6.

1. odoratum aere *A* 2. motibus *Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 92/3] *om. A* vocibus *B Gel* 3. lacrymabilis *B Gel* 4. augerem *A* 5. quod] quo *Rig* praesciens *A corr.* 6. Exinde] [non enim] exinde *B* [al. deest] *Bmg* non enim exinde *Pam* 8. et neminem *B Gel* 11. animum... non habens *om. A* 12. lactentium *B Gel* 13. expediendo *B Gel* (experiendo *Bmg*) hebetes *ex* habentes *A* habentes *B* 15. utque *A corr.* vim] eum *Rfd* 16. DE NATURALIBUS AB DE CAETERIS NATURALIBUS ANIMAE *Gel* omnia *om. A* 18. insita sunt] inquit: sunt *Iun. susp.* 19. magisterque] magister quae *A* 22. et] ut *Pam* 23. est] sit *Scal* 25. condicione *A* 28. et brutos *om. A* 29. Colyttum *B Gel* 30. elocuntur *A* praecoe *B Gel* 33. Cliniae] inclinae *A* locum] loci vim *A* procurarent *B Gel* 34. argute *A* 35. disciplinam *A* disciplinamque *B* 36. Tamen vulgata] tam mulgata *A*

timidos inludunt, Sallustius vanos Mauros et feroces Dalmatas pulsat, mendaces Cretas etiam apostolus inurit. 4. Fortassean et de corpore et valetudine aliquid accedat. Opimitas sapientiam impedit, exilitas expedit, paralysis mentem prodigit, pthisis servat. Quanto magis de accidentibus habebuntur quae citra corpulentiam et valentiam vel acunt vel obtundunt! Acunt doctrinae disciplinae artes et experientiae negotia studia; obtundunt inscitiae ignaviae desidiae libidines inexperience otia vitia, super haec, si et aliquae praesunt potestates. 5. Enimvero praesunt, secundum nos quidem deus dominus et diabolus aemulus, secundum communem autem opinionem providentia et fatum et necessitas et fortuna et arbitrii libertas. Nam haec et philosophi distinguunt, et nos secundum fidem disserenda suo iam vovimus titulo. 6. Apparet quanta sint quae unam animae naturam varie collocarint, ut vulgo naturae deputentur, quando non species sint, sed sortes naturae et substantiae unius, illius scilicet quam deus in Adam contulit et matricem omnium fecit; atque adeo sortes erunt, non species substantiae unius, id est varietas ista moralis, quanta nunc est, tanta non fuerit in ipso principe generis Adam. Debuerant enim fuisse haec omnia in illo ut in fonte naturae atque inde cum tota varietate manasse, si varietas naturae / fuisset. 20 f. 133^v

21. 1. Quodsi uniformis natura animae ab initio in Adam ante tot ingenia, ergo non multiformis, quia uniformis, per tot ingenia, nec triformis, ut adhuc trinitas Valentiniana caedatur, quae nec ipsa in Adam recognoscitur. 2. Quid enim spiritale in illo? Si quia prophetavit magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam: hoc os ex ossibus meis et caro ex carne mea vocabitur mulier; propterea relinquet homo matrem et matrem et agglutinabitur mulieri suae et erunt duo in carnem unam, hoc postea obvenit, cum in illum deus amentiam immisit, spiritalem vim, qua

2. Tit. 1,12. 26. Gen. 2, 23/4.

3. valetudine *A*; approbant *Lfst. Spr. T. 62*; *W. A. Bachrens Beitr. 298*] de valetudine *B Gel* exilitas expedit *om. A* 4. pthisis *B Gel*
5. circa *B Gel* et valentiam *om. A* 6. obtundunt *A* alterum acunt *A* et experientiae *B*] experientiae *A* et experientia *Gel* experientiae *Rfd* 7. ignavia *B Gel* 8. aliquae *Mercerus*] alia quae *A B Gel* praesunt] presunt *A* 9. dominus deus *B Gel*
10. providentia et fatum *scripsi*] providentiae fatum *A* et providentiae fatum *B* et providentia et fatum *Gel* 11. et fortuna et *Gel*] et fortunae *A* et fortunae et *B* fortunae et *Th. St. T. 3,33* 12. distinguunt *A* vovimus *Bmg*] vovimus *ex novimus A* novimus *B Gel* 13. variae *A* 14. deputantur *A corr.* 16. adeo] ideo *Rfd susp.* 17. id est *A B Gel*] ut et *Rig* item *Oehl* moralis *Bmg*] mortalis *AB* quum quanta *Urs* quae quanta *Oehl* quia quanta *Rfd susp.* 20. manasses *A* si *om. A* 22. quia uniformis] *om. A* quia multiformis *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,62*; contra quem disputat *Th. St. T. 1,74* 23. iam nec *B Gel* triformis *B*] quadriformis *A Bmg* qua triformis *Rig* caedatur] credatur *Bmg* quae] quia *Iun susp.* 24. recognoscitur *A* 25. profetavit *A* 28. adglutinabitur *B* 29. carne *A* unam *om. A* 30. cum] quam *La Cerdà susp.*

constat prophetia. 3. Si et malum in eo apparuit transgressionis
admissum, nec hoc naturale deputandum est, quod instinctu serpentis
operatus est, tam non naturale quam nec materiale, quia et materiae
fidem iam exclusimus. Quodsi nec spiritale nec quod dicitur materiale
5 proprium in illo fuit (etsi ex materia fuisset mali semen), superest,
ut solum in illo et unicum fuerit naturale quod censetur animale,
quod statu simplex et uniforme defendimus. 4. De hoc plane relin-
quitur quaeri, an demutabile debeat credi, quod naturale dicatur.
Idem enim convertibilem negant naturam, ut trinitatem suam in
10 singulis proprietatibus figant, quia arbor bona malos non ferat fructus
nec mala bonos, et nemo de spinis metat ficus et de tribulis uvas.
Ergo si ita est, neque de lapidibus filios Abrahae suscitare poterit
deus nec genimina viperarum facere paenitentiae fructus et erravit
apostolus scribens: eratis et vos aliquando tenebrae
15 et: fuimus et nos aliquando natura filii irae
et: in his vos quoque fuistis, sed abluti estis.
f. 134 5. Sed nunquam discordabunt sententiae sanctae. / Non dabit enim
arbor mala bonos fructus, si non inseratur, et bona malos dabit, si
non colatur, et lapides filii Abrahae fient, si in fidem Abrahae formen-
20 tur, et genimina viperarum fructum paenitentiae facient, si venena
malignitatis exspuerint. 6. Haec erit vis divinae gratiae, potentior
utique natura, habens in nobis subiacentem sibi liberam arbitrii
potestatem quod αὐτεξούσιον dicitur, quae cum sit et ipsa naturalis
atque mutabilis, quoquo vertitur, natura convertitur. Inesse autem
25 nobis τὸ αὐτεξούσιον naturaliter iam et Marcioni ostendimus et
Hermogeni. 7. Quid nunc, si et naturae condicio sic erit definienda,
ut duplex determinetur, natorum et innatorum, factorum et infec-
torum? Atque ita quod natum factumque constiterit, eius natura
capiet demutationem: et renasci enim poterit et refici. Innatum
30 autem et infectum immobile stabit. Quod cum soli deo competat,
ut soli innato et infecto et idcirco immortalis et inconvertibili, abso-
lutum est ceterorum omnium natorum atque factorum convertibilem
et demutabilem esse naturam, ut, etsi trinitas animae adscribenda
esset, ex mutatione accidentiae, non ex institutione naturae depu-
35 taretur.

22. 1. Cetera animae naturalia iam a nobis audiit Hermogenes

10. Luc. 6, 43/4. 12. Mtth. 3, 7/9. 14. Eph. 5, 8. 15. Eph. 2, 3.
16. 1 Cor. 6, 11.

1. profetia *A* 3. materiale quia et *om.* *A* 5. etsi *A*] et si *B*
Gel nam si *Urs Rig*₃ nam sic *Rig*₁₋₂ post materia virgulam
ponit *Urs* 7. status *AB* uniformem *A B* 8. debeat . . . naturale
om. *A* 9. iidem *Gel* naturam] naturalem *Bmg* 13. gemina *A corr.*
16. post et *distinxi* 17. numquam *A* 19. fili *A* formentur] fient formentur
A corr. 20. gemina *A corr.* 21. expuerint *A* 22. arbitrarii *A*
23. autexusion (*m. rec. in mg.* αὐτεξούσιον) *A* quae cum] quaecumque
A corr. 24. atque et *Seml.* natura convertitur *A om.*
25. τὸ ΑΥΤΕΞΟΥΣΙΟΝ *A* et Marcioni] et *om.* *Rig*₃ 26. et naturae] et
om. *Seml.* 31. et inconvertibili *om.* *A* 36. a sup. vers. *A m. posteriore*

cum ipsorum defensione et probatione, per quae dei potius quam materiae propinqua cognoscitur. Hic solummodo nominabuntur, ne praeterita videantur. Dedimus enim illi et libertatem arbitrii, ut supra scripsimus, et dominationem rerum et divinationem interdum, seposita quae per dei gratiam obvenit ex prophetia. Itaque iam ab isto dispositionis retractatu recedam, ut ordinem eius expungam. / f. 134^v

2. Definimus animam dei flatu natam, immortalem, corporalem, effigiatam, substantia simplicem, de suo sapientem, varie procedentem, liberam arbitrii, accidentis obnoxiam, per ingenia mutabilem, rationalem, dominatricem, divinatricem, ex una redundantem. Sequitur nunc ut quomodo ex una redundet consideremus, id est, unde et quando et qua ratione sumatur.

23. 1. Quidam de caelis devenisse se credunt tanta persuasione quanta et illuc indubitate regressuros repromittunt, ut Saturninus Menandri Simoniani discipulus induxit, hominem affirmans ab angelis factum primoque opus futile et invalidum et instabile in terra vermis instar palpitasse, quod consistendi vires deessent, dehinc ex misericordia summae potestatis, ad cuius effigiem, nec tamen plene perspectam, temere structus fuisset, scintillulam vitae consecutum, quae illud exsuscitavit et erexerit et constantius animavit et post decessum vitae ad matricem relatura sit. 2. Sed et Carpocrates tantundem sibi de superioribus vindicat, ut discipuli eius animas suas iam et Christo, nedum apostolis, et peraequent et cum volunt praeferant, quas perinde de sublimi virtute conceperint despectrices mundi-potentium principatum. 3. Apelles sollicitas refert animas terrenis escis de supercaelestibus sedibus ab igneo angelo, deo Israelis et nostro, qui exinde illis peccatricem circumfinxerit carnem. 4. Examen Valentini semen Sophiae infulcit animae, per quod historias atque milesias aeonum suorum ex imaginibus visibilium recognoscunt. 5. Doleo bona fide Platonem omnium haeticorum condimentarium factum. Illius est enim et in Phaedone, quod animae hinc euntes sint illuc, et inde huc / ; item in Timaeo, quod genimina dei delegata sibi mortalium genitura accepto initio animae immortalis mortale ei circumgelaverint corpus; tum, quod mundus hic imago sit alterius alicuius. 6. Quae omnia ut fidei commendet, et animam retro in superioribus cum deo egisse in commercio idearum et inde huc transvenire et hic quae retro norit de exemplaribus recensere, novum

3. preterita *A* 4. interdum *om. A* 5. gratia *A* 7. corporalem *om. A*; *uncinis inclusit B* al. deest' *Bmg* 8. sapientem] patientem *Gel* variae *A*
9. accidentis *fun Urs* 11. ut] et *B*; corr. *A* 13. UNDE ANIMA *AB*
UNDE ANIMA, ADVERSUS HAERETICOS QUI EAM DE COELIS DEFERUNT *Gel* 14. et *om. B Gel* Saturnus *B* Saturnius *Rig*₁—2
16. futile *B Gel* et invalidum *om. A* 19. scintillulam *B* illum
B Gel 24. proinde *B Gel* de *om. A* despectrices *scripsi*] despectrice
A B Gel mundi potentium *AB* 25. principatum *A* 26. desuper
caelestibus *AB* (coe-*B*) israhelis *A* Israel *Rig* 27. circumfixerit
A Kellner 323₁ 28. infulsit *Rig*₂ atque] aequae *rel* easque *Lat*
29. millesias *A* eonum *A* 31. phedone *A* Phaedrone *B* 32. gemina *B*
germina *Gel* 33. immortalis *Rfd susp.* 36. hunc *A*

elaboravit argumentum, μαθήσεις ἀναμνήσεις, id est discentias reminiscencias esse; venientes enim inde huc animas oblivisci eorum in quibus prius fuerint, dehinc ex his visibilibus edoctas recordari. Cum igitur huiusmodi argumento illa insinuentur a Platone quae
 5 haeretici mutantur, satis haereticos repercutiam, si argumentum Platonis elidam.

24. 1. Primo quidem oblivionis capacem animam non cedam, quia tantam illi concessit divinitatem, ut deo adaequetur. Innatam eam facit, quod et solum armare potuissem ad testimonium plenae
 10 divinitatis; adicit immortalem, incorruptibilem, incorporalem, quia hoc et deum credit, invisibilem, ineffigibilem, uniformem, principalem, rationalem, intellectualem. Quid amplius proscriberet animam, si eam deum nuncuparet? 2. Nos autem, qui nihil deo adpendimus, hoc ipso animam longe infra deum expendimus, quod natam eam
 15 agnoscimus ac per hoc dilutioris divinitatis et exilioris felicitatis, ut flatum, non ut spiritum; et si immortalem, ut hoc sit divinitatis, tamen passibilem, ut hoc sit nativitatis, ideoque et a primordio exorbitationis capacem et inde etiam oblivionis affinem. Satis de isto cum Hermogene. 3. Ceterum quae, ut haberi merito possit ex perae-
 20 quatione omnium proprietatum deus, nulli passioni subiacebit, ita f. 135^v nec oblivioni, cum tanta sit iniuria / oblivio quanta est gloria eius cuius iniuria est, memoria scilicet, quam et ipse Plato sensuum et intellectuum salutem et Cicero thesaurum omnium studiorum prae-
 25 dicavit. Nec hoc iam in dubium deducetur, an tam divina anima memoriam potuerit amittere, sed an quam amisit recuperare denuo possit. Quae enim non debuit oblivisci, si oblita sit, nescio an valeat recordari. Ita utrumque meae animae, non Platonicae congruet. 4. Secundo gradu opponam: natura compotem animam facis idearum illarum, an non? Immo natura, inquis. Nemo ergo concedet natu-
 30 ralem scientiam naturalium excidere; artium excidet, studiorum; excidet doctrinarum, disciplinarum; excidet fortasse et ingeniorum

1. ΜΑΘΗΣΕΙΣ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΕΙΣ A 2. huc inde Gel 3. edoctas recordari Rig] et doctas recordari A recordari edoctas B Gel 4. igitur om. A insinu-
 antur A 5. eretici A 7. ADVERSUS PLATONIS μαθήσεις καὶ ἀναμνήσεις A B (graeca add. A m. rec.) ADVERSUS PLATONIS ARGUMENTUM, QUOD DISCENTIAS REMINISCENCIAS DICAT Gel 8. concessit Bmg 9. eam] enim Iun susp. 10. addicit B incorporalem ante invisibilem (11) ponere vult Iun 11. invisibilem om. A 13. eam] enim A corr. enim Iun appendimus B Gel 15. et om. B Gel 16. immortalem, ut hoc sit divinitatis, tamen Gel] immortalem tamen A immortalem (tamen passibilem) ut hoc sit divinitatis: Et cum immortalem, tamen B 19. cum hermogene, cum ermogene A haberi] deus haberi B ceterum quae, ut . . . possit, ex . . . deus, nulli Iun distinguit 20. virgulam ante deus exhibent B Gel nulli] ut nulli Hartel Potr. Stud. 4,62 ita] ea Rfd susp. ista Kroyrn. 109 susp. 21. iniuria] iniuriarum Bmg oblivio] ob-via legibile in A 22. memoriae Iun Kroyrn. 109 23. intellectum A corr. 24. Nec ne A 25. amisit A 27. ita om. A; approbat Kroyrn. 109 30. excidere; artium Iun Gomperz 66/7] excidere artium; AB Gel artium excidet, studiorum excidet, doctrinarum, disciplinarum excident, fortasse et, Iun distinguit 31. alterum excidet] excident B Gel

et affectuum, quae naturae videntur, non tamen sunt, quia, ut praemisimus, et pro locis et pro institutionibus et pro corpulentis ac valetudinibus et pro potestatibus dominatricibus et pro libertatibus arbitrii ex accidentibus constant. 5. Naturalium vero scientia ne in bestiis quidem deficit. Plane obliviscetur feritatis leo mansuetudinis eruditione praeventus et cum toto suggestu iubarum delitium fiet Berenices alicuius reginae lingua genas eius emaculans. Mores bestiam relinquent, scientia naturalium permanebit. Non obliviscetur idem naturalium pabulorum, naturalium remediorum, naturalium terrorum; et si de piscibus et si de placentis regina ei obtulerit, carnem desiderabit, et si languenti theriacam composuerit, simiam leo requirit, et si nullum illi venabulum obfirmabit, gallum tamen formidabit. 6. Perinde et homini omnium forsitan obliuississimo inoblitterata perseverabit sola scientia naturalium, ut sola scilicet naturalis, memor semper manducandi in esurie et bibendi in siti, et oculis videndum et auribus audiendum et naribus odorandum et ore gustandum / et manu contrectandum. Hi sunt certe sensus, quos philosophia depretiat intellectualium praelatione. 7. Igitur si naturalis scientia sensualium permanet, quomodo intellectualium, quae potior habetur, intercidet? Unde nunc ipsa vis obliuionis antecedentis recordationem? 'Ex multitudine', ait, 'temporis'. Satis improspecte! Quantitas enim temporis non pertinebit ad eam rem quae innata dicatur ac per hoc potissimum aeterna credatur. Quod enim aeternum est, eo quia et innatum est, neque initium neque finem temporis admittendo nullum modum temporis patitur; cui temporis modus nullus est, nec ulla demutatione tempori subest nec ea de multitudine temporis vis est. 8. Si tempus in causa est obliuionis, cur ex quo anima corpori inducitur, memoria delabitur, quasi exinde tempus anima sustineat, quae sine dubio prior corpore non fuit utique sine tempore? Ingressa vero corpus statimne obliviscitur, an aliquanto post? Si statim, et quae erit temporis nondum subputandi multitudo? Infantia scilicet. Si aliquanto post, ergo illo in spatio ante tempora obliuionis memor adhuc aget anima. Et quale est, ut postea obliviscatur et rursus postea recordetur? Quoquo autem tempore illam obliuio inruerit, quantus hic etiam habebitur modus temporis? Tota, opinor, vitae decursio satis non erit ad evertendam memoriam tanti ante corpus aevi. 9. Sed rursus Plato causam demutat in corpus, quasi et hoc

1. ut] aut *A* corr.; *B* premisimus *A* 3. valetudinibus *A* corr. 3. alterum et *Rig* delet 9. naturalium remediorum om. *A* 12. obfirmabit *A* obfirmabitur *Rfd* susp. 14. memori *Iun* 15. manducandum esurie et bibendum siti *Iun* aesurię (a inductum) *A* alterum et] sciēt Gomperz 63 videndum, etc.] videndi, etc. *Rfd* susp.; sed cf. *Lfst. Spr. Tert.* 12, 17. depreciat *A* 19. intercidit *B* *Gel* 21. inprospectis *A* in prospectis *B* 23. et om. *A* 26. tempori subest *A* *Lat*] temporis subest *B* *Gel* nec... vis est om. *A* ea de *Rig*] eadem *B* *Gel* eadem in *Lat* ei de *Rfd* tempori *Rig* vis] visa *Iun* susp. 30. statim ne *A* et quaerit *A* ecquae crit *Oehl* 31. supputandi *Gel* 32. aliquando *A* 33. post anima interrogationis signum ponunt *Oehl* *Rfd* 35. virgulam post temporis ponunt *B* *Gel* 36. evertendam *Lat*] vertendam *A* *B* *Gel*; damnat *Hoppe Beitr.* 107, 37. demotat *Rfd* deputat *Blf Mus.* 41 (1934), 312; lectionem traditam vindicavi *Mnemos.* III 3 (1936), 169/70

- fide dignum, ut nata substantia innatae vim extinguat. Magnae autem ac multae differentiae corporum pro gentilitate, pro magnitudine, pro habitudine, pro aetate, / pro valetudine. Num ergo et oblivionem differentiae aestimabuntur? Sed uniformis oblivio est; ergo non erit corporalitas multiformis in causa exitus uniformis. 10. Multa item documenta teste ipso Platone divinationem animae probaverunt, quae proposuimus iam Hermogeni. Sed nec quisquam hominum non et ipse aliquando praesagam animam suam sentit, aut ominis aut periculi aut gaudii augurem. Si divinationi non obstrepat corpus, nec memoriae, opinor, officiet. In eodem certe corpore et obliviscuntur animae et recordantur. Si qua corporis ratio incutit oblivionem, quomodo contrariam eius admittet recordationem (quia et ipsa post oblivionem recordatio memoria recidiva est)? Quod primae memoriae adversatur, cur non et secundae refragatur? 11. Postremo, qui magis reminiscerentur quam pueruli, ut recentiores animae, ut nondum immersae domesticis ac publicis curis, ut ipsis solis debitae studiis, quorum discentiae reminiscendae fiunt? Immo cur non ex aequo omnes recordamur, cum ex aequo omnes obliviscamur? Sed tantummodo philosophi; ne hi quidem omnes. Plato scilicet solus in tanta gentium silva, in tanto sapientium prato, idearum et oblitus et recordatus est. 12. Igitur et si nullo modo consistit argumentatio ista praecipua, totum illud pariter eversum est, cui accommodata est, ut animae et innatae et in caelestibus conversatae et consciae divinorum illic et inde delatae et hic recordatae crederentur, ad occasiones plane haereticis subministrandas.
- f. 137 25. / 1. Iam nunc regrediar ad causam huius excessus, uti reddam, quomodo animae ex una redundant, quando et ubi et qua ratione sumantur; de qua specie nihil refert, a philosopho an ab haeretico an a vulgo quaestio occurrat. 2. Nulla interest professoribus veritatis de adversariis eius, maxime tam audacibus quam sunt primo isti, qui praesumunt non in utero concipi animam nec cum carnis figuratione compingi atque produci, sed et effuso iam

1. innatae] innata ae A 2. ac] et Gel multe A
 gentilitate A 4. estimabuntur A 5. in causa exitus uniformis
 om. A 8. aut ominis Bmg] aut hominis AB aut vigilans aut
 insomnis vel aut insomnis aut vigilans Rfd susp. ut eminus Hartel
 ap. Rfd 10. et om. A 13. post est interrogationis signum
 ponit Rfd 14. refragetur B Gel 15. ut recentiores] virentiores
 Bmg ut recentioris Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,62; sed cf. Th. St. T. 2,32
 16. immerse A 17. debitae A; vindicat Th. St. T. 2,32] debite B deditae
 Gel reminiscendae om. A 19. ne] nec Lat. et Kroym. 109 qui sic
 distinguit: immo... recordamur, cum... obliviscamur, sed... philosophi,
 nec... omnes? hi] ii Lat 20. gentium] sagientium Hartel ap. Rfd et
 Patr. Stud. 4,63 21. alterum et om. A et si] et om. B Gel 23. et
 innatae] et sup. vers. A 24. conscie A delatae et oblitae Rfd susp.
 25. occasiones A 26. ANIMAM ET CARNEM SIMUL CONCIPI AB
 DE CONCEPTU ANIMAE ADVERSUS EOS QUI POST PARTUM
 CORPORI EAM INDUCUNT Gel egrediar A ut Gel rereddam A
 27. redundet A corr. qua] ex qua B Gel 28. spetie, anihil A
 29. in nulla Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,17 32. et del. Lat

partu nondum vivo infanti extrinsecus inprimi; ceterum semen ex concubitu muliebribus locis sequestratum motuque naturali vegetatum compinguescere in solam substantiam carnis; eam editam et de uteri fornace fumantem et calore solutam, ut ferrum ignitum et ibidem frigidae immersum, ita aeris rigore percussam et vim animale[m] rapere et vocalem sonum reddere. Hoc Stoici cum Aenesidemo et ipse interdum Plato, cum dicit perinde animam extraneam alias et extorrem uteri prima adspiratione nascentis infantis adduci, sicut expiratione novissima educi. Videbimus an ex sententia finxerit. Ne ex medicis quidem defuit Hicesius, et naturae et artis suae praevaricator. 3. Pudit, opinor, illos id statuere quod feminae agnoscerent. Et quanto ruborator exitus, a feminis revinci quam probari! In ista namque specie nemo tam idoneus magister arbiter testis quam sexus ipsius. Respondete, matres, vos quae praegnant[es], vos quae puerperae, steriles et masculi taceant, vestrae naturae veritas quaeritur, vestrae passionis fides convenitur, an aliquam in fetu sentiatis vivacitatem alienam de vestro, / de quo f. 137^v palpitent ilia, micent latera, tota ventris ambitio pulsetur, ubique ponderis regio mutetur; an hi motus gaudia vestra sint et certa securitas, quod ita infantem et vivere confidatis et ludere; an si desierit inquires eius, illi prius pertimescatis; an et audiat iam in vobis, cum ad novum sonum excutitur; an et ciborum vanitates illi desideretis, illi etiam fastidiatis; an et valetudinibus invicem communicetis, ille quidem usque et contusionibus vestris, quibus et ipse intus per eadem membra signatur, rapiens sibi iniurias matris. 4. Si livor ac rubor sanguinis passio est, sine anima non erit sanguis; si valetudo omnis accessio est, sine anima non erit valetudo; si alimonia inedia crementa decrementa pavor motus tractatio est animae, his qui fungitur vivet. Denique desinit vivere qui desinit fungi. Denique et mortui eduntur; quomodo, nisi et vivi? Qui autem et mortui, nisi qui prius vivi? Atquin

3. compinguescere *Lat* solam] solidam *Pricaeus Kellner* 326, 5. ibidem] idem *Rfd susp.* frigide *A B* 6. vii *A corr.* 7. interdu *A* proinde *B* (perinde *Bmg*) 8. adspirationē *A* 9. aspiratione *A Bmg* novissima educi *Rig*] novissime duci *A* novissime duci *B Gel* novissime educi *Lat* ex sententia *Rig*_{1/2} in *Observ.*] ex sententia *A* sententiam *B Gel* ex sententia sua *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,63 10. fixerit *A corr.*; *Rig* in *Observ.* Hicesius] hic eius *A* hic *Esius B* 11. id *A*] hoc *B Gel* 12. Et *A Bmg*] at *B* aut *Gel* ruborator *Lat*] roborator *A B Gel* 13. spetiē *A* 14. sexus ipsus *Scal* sexus ipsius sensus *Rfd* sexus ipse *Gomperz* 68; lectionem traditam vindicat *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,63/4 vos quae (bis) *Gomperz* 68] vos quae *A* vosque *B Gel* 15. praegnant[es] *A* 17. vestro, de quo] vestra de qua *Rfd susp.*; quem refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,64 19. an] han *A corr.* 21. inquires *A* et in vobis *Gel* 22. vanitates] varietates *Iun* 24. usque et *A B*] usque *Gel* usque de *Lat* usque eo *Urs* usque eo, de *Rig* usque ex *Oehl* ipsae *Iun* 25. livorum *A* 26. sanguis . . . 27. non erit om. *A* omnis] animae *Urs* 27. inacidia *A* 28. anime *A* his] is *B* iis *Urs* 29. prius desinit] desiit *A* alterum Denique] sedenim *Gomperz* 69 30. prius nisi] si *A*; *Gomperz* 69 prius et] ut *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4, 64/5 (hoc modo distinguens: Denique . . . fungi, denique . . . eduntur. Quomodo, nisi ut vivi?) *Gomperz* 69 (Sedenim et mortui eduntur; quomodo si ut vivi?, sc. adversarius dicit) et mortui] ei mortui *susp. Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,64 mortui *Gomperz* 69

et in ipso adhuc utero infans trucidatur necessaria crudelitate, cum in exitu obliquatus denegat partum, matricida, ni moriturus. 5. Itaque est inter arma medicorum et cum organo, ex quo prius patescere secreta coguntur tortili temperamento, cum anulocultro, quo intus
 5 membra caeduntur anxio arbitrio, cum hebete unco, quo totum facinus extrahitur violento puerperio. Est etiam aeneum spiculum, quo iugulatio ipsa dirigitur caeco latrocinio; ἐμβρυοσφάκτην appellant de infanticidii officio, utique viventis infantis peremptorium. Hoc et Hippocrates habuit et Asclepiades et Erasistratus et maiorum
 10 quoque prosector Herophilus et mitior ipse Soranus, certi animal f. 138 esse conceptum atque ita miserti infelicissimae huiusmodi / infantiae, ut prius occidatur, ne viva lanietur. 6. De qua sceleris necessitate nec dubitabat, credo, Hicesius, iam natis animam superducens ex aeris frigidi pulsu, quia et ipsum vocabulum animae penes Graecos
 15 de refrigeratione respondens. Num ergo barbarae Romanaeque gentes aliter animantur, quia animam aliud quid quam ψυχὴν cognominaverunt? Quantae vero nationes sub ferventissimo axe censentur colorem quoque excoctae? Unde illis animam, quibus aeris rigor nullus? Taceo cubiculares aestus et omnem illic caloris paraturam
 20 entitentibus necessariam, quas afflari vel maxime periculum est. In ipsis paene balneis fetus elabitur, et statim vagitus auditur. 7. Ceterum si aeris rigor thesaurus est animae, extra Germanias et Scythias et Alpes et Argaeos nemo debuit nasci. Atquin et populi frequentiores apud orientalem et meridielem temperaturam et ingenia expeditiora,
 25 omnibus Sarmatis etiam mente torpentibus. Et animi enim de rigoribus scitiores provenirent, si animae de frigusculis evenirent; cum substantia enim et vis. 8. His ita praestructis possumus illos quoque recogitare qui exsecto matris utero vivi aerem hauserunt, Liberi aliqui et Scipiones. Quodsi qui, ut Plato, perinde non putat duas
 30 animas in unum convenire, sicut nec corpora, ego illi non modo duas animas in unum congestas ostendissem, sicut et corpora, in fetibus, verum et alia multa cum anima conserta, daemonis scilicet, nec

1. in om. A 2. in exitu] inexit A obligatus A Bmg ni] qui A B (in B uncinis inclusum) 3. est A] et B Gel et om. A cum organo (vel cum organio) Th. St. T. 2,60/1] cum organia A organa B Gel organon Urs ex] est Gel aes Lindn 4. anulocultro Rig] anulo cultro A anulo, cultro B anulo cultrato Gel 5. cum] aut cum Iun susp. 6. facinus] pecus Gel pignus Rfd susp. attrahitur B Gel 7. latro. cinio A ἐμβρυοσφάκτην Urs] ΕΜΒΡΥΟΣΦΑΚΤΗΝ A ἐμβρυοσφάκτην B ἐμβρυοσφάκτην Bmg ἐμβρυοσφάκτην Gel ἐμβρυοσφάκτην Lat ἐμβρυοσφάκτην Scal 9. maiorum] vivorum Diels Dox. Gr. 206. 10. animales se A corr. 11. miserati B Gel infelicissime B 12. ne viva lanietur Gel] ne vivat A ne vivat lanietur B 13. hic Esius B 14. quia et] quiait A quia ut B paenes A 15. de refrigeratione respondens. Num A B Gel; vindicat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,65/6] de refrigeratione. Respondeat (-eas Rfd) num Urs Rfd de refrigeratione respondeat. Num Rig 16. quia] qui A quid quam] quicquam ex quicquid A ΨΥΧΗΝ A 18. quoque] quaeque Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,66 animam B Gel 20. quae Seml 22. et Scythias delet Rig₃ Scythias Iun] cythias A Scythas B Gel 23. Argaeos] algeos A 25. armatis A B 29. putatat A corr. 32. cum Gel] ut cum A B; defendit Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,66 daemonia Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,66

unius, ut in Socrate ipso, verum et septenarii spiritus, ut in Magdalena, et legionarii numeri, ut in Geraseno, quo facilius anima cum anima conseretur ex societate substantiae quam spiritus nequam ex diversitate naturae. 9. At idem in sexto Legum / monens cavere, ne vitatio f. 138^v seminis ex aliqua vilitate concubitus labem corpori et animae supparet, 5 nescio de pristina magis an de ista sententia sibi exciderit. Ostendit enim animam de semine induci, quod curari monet, non de prima aspiratione nascentis. Unde, oro, similitudine animae quoque parentibus de ingeniis respondemus secundum Cleanthis testimonium, si non et ex animae semine educimur? Cur autem et veteres astrologi 10 genituram hominis ab initio conceptus dirigebant, si non exinde et anima est, ad quam aequae pertinet, si quid est, flatus?

26. 1. Sed omnis inaequalitas sententiae humanae usque ad dei terminos. In nostras iam lineas gradum colligam, ut quod philosophis 15 medicisque respondi, Christiano probem. De tuo, frater, fundamento fidem aedifica; aspice viventes uteros sanctissimarum feminarum nec modo spirantes iam illic infantes, verum etiam prophetantes. 2. Ecce viscera Rebeckae inquietantur et longe adhuc partus et aeris nullus impulsus. Ecce duplex fetus in locis matris tumultuatur et nusquam adhuc populi duo. Portentosa forsitan petulantia infantiae 20 ante certantis quam viventis, ante animosae quam animatae, si tantummodo matrem subsultando turbasset. At cum partus aperitur et numerus inspicitur et auguratus recognoscitur, puto, iam non animae solummodo probantur infantum, sed et pugnae. 3. Detinebatur qui praevenerat nasci a praevento necdum plenius edito, tantum 25 manu nato. Et si ipse animam de prima aspiratione potabat Platonico more aut de aeris rigore carpebat Stoica forma, quid ille qui expectabatur, qui adhuc intus detinebatur et foris iam detinebat? Nondum, opinor, / spirans plantam fratris invaserat, etiamnunc calens matre se priore prodisse cupiebat. O infantem et aemulum et validum 30 et olim contentiosum, credo, quia vivum. 4. Aspice etiam singulares conceptus et quidem monstrosiores, sterilis et virginis, quae vel hoc ipso imperfectos edere potuissent pro eversione naturae, ut altera

1. Marc. 16, 9.

2. Marc. 5, 1 seqq.

18. Gen. 25, 22 seqq.

32. Luc. 1, 41. 46.

3. conseretur *Gel*] conferetur *AB* censeretur *Urs* prius ex] et *A* corr.
4. viciatio *A* 6. pristinis *A* 8. oro te *B Gel* 9. Cleantis *B*
10. prius et om. *A* semine *A* 11. dirigebant *AB*] digerebant
Bmg Gel et om. *A* 12. est? ad *Iun* ad] at *A* corr.
si quid] quidquid *Bmg* flatus] status *Urs*; *Kellner* 329,
15. responde *A* corr. 16. aedificem *Bmg* feminarum *A*
19. tumultuantur *Rig*, 21. animosae quam animatae] animos aequa
animate *ex* animos aequa animitate *A* animos aequae animate *B*
22. sussultando *A* 24. infantum *B Gel* 25. prevenerat *A* nec
dum *Rig* 26. spiratione *B Gel* portabat *AB* (potabat *Bmg*)
platonii comore *A* 29. opinor] post hoc verbum in *A* duo folia desunt quae
interierunt postquam paginae numeratae sunt; man. s. XIX in fol. 141r:
hic duo folia desiderantur in matre *Iun* 31. contentiosum! credo
Iun 33. pro eversione] proversione *Iun* ut altera] altera ut *Rfd*
contra quem disputat *W. A. Baehrens Beitr.* 311

seminis stupida, altera intacta. Decebat, si forte, sine anima nasci, qui fuerant non rite concepti, sed et illi vivunt in suo quisque utero. Exsultat Elizabeth, Johannes intus impulerat; glorificat dominum Maria, Christus intus instinxerat. Agnoscunt matres suos invicem
 5 fetus, agnitae mutuo ab ipsis utique viventibus, qui non tantum animae erant, verum et spiritus. 5. Sic et ad Hieremiam legis dei vocem: priusquam te in utero fingerem, novi te. Si fingit deus in utero, et afflat ex primordii forma: et finxit deus hominem et flavit in eum flatum vitae.
 10 Nec nosset autem hominem deus in utero nisi totum: et priusquam exires de vulva, sanctificavi te. Et mortuum adhuc corpus? Utique nequaquam: deus enim vivorum, non mortuorum.

27. 1. Quomodo igitur animal conceptum? Simulne conflata
 15 utriusque substantia corporis animaeque an altera earum praecedente? Immo simul ambas et concipi et confici, perfici dicimus, sicut et promi, nec ullum intervenire momentum in conceptu quo locus ordinatur. 2. Recogita enim de novissimis prima: si mors non aliud determinatur quam disiunctio corporis animaeque, contrarium morti
 20 vita non aliud definietur quam coniunctio corporis animaeque; si disiunctio simul utrique substantiae accidit per mortem, hoc debet coniunctionis forma mandasse pariter obvenientis per vitam utrique substantiae. 3. Porro vitam a conceptu agnoscimus, quia animam a conceptu vindicamus; exinde enim vita, quo anima. Pariter ergo
 25 in vitam compinguntur quae pariter in mortem separantur. Tunc si alteri primatum damus, alteri secundatum, seminis quoque discernenda sunt tempora pro statu ordinis. Et quando collocabitur corporis semen, quando animae? 4. Immo si tempora seminum dividuntur, et materiae diversae habebuntur ex distantia temporum. Nam etsi
 30 duas species confitebimur seminis, corporalem et animalem, indiscretas tamen vindicamus et hoc modo contemporales eiusdemque momenti. Ne itaque pudeat necessariae interpretationis. Natura veneranda est, non erubescenda. Concubitus libido, non condicio foedavit. Excessus, non status est impudicus, siquidem benedictus status apud
 35 deum: crescite et in multitudinem proficite, excessus vero maledictus, adulteria et stupra et lupanaria. 5. In hoc itaque sollemni sexuum officio quod marem ac feminam miscet, in concubitu dico communi, scimus et animam et carnem simul fungi, animam concupiscentia, carnem opera, animam instinctu, carnem
 40 actu. Unico igitur impetu utriusque toto homine concusso despumatur

7. Hier. 1, 5. 8. Gen. 2, 7. 10. Hier. 1, 5. 12. Mtth. 22, 32. 35. Gen. 1, 28.

1. semini *Iun* 10. : et priusquam] Et, priusquam *Iun*
 12. interrogationis signum post utique ponunt *Lat Iun* 15. utriusque] utrique *Bmg* 16. confici, perfici *B*; vindicat *Lfst. Spr. Tert. 30*] confici et perfici *Gel* 18. primum *Rfd*; quem refutat *Gomperz 69*
 20. quam]. Iam *B* 25. compinguntur *Bmg*] confinguntur *B* tunc *om. Gel Iun* 27. collocabitur *B* 31. eiusdemque] eius denique *B*
 40. despumatur *Iun Urs*; vindicat *Hoppe Beitr. 99₃*] despumat in *B Gel*

semen totius hominis habens ex corporali substantia humorem, ex animali calorem. Et si frigidum nomen est anima Graecorum, quare corpus exempta ea friget? 6. Denique ut adhuc verecundia magis periclitetur quam probatione, in illo ipso voluptatis ultimae aestu quo genitale virus expellitur, nonne aliquid de anima quoque sentimus exire atque adeo marcescimus et devigescimus cum lucis detrimento? Hoc erit semen animale, protinus ex animae destillatione, sicut et virus illud corporale semen ex carnis defaecatione. 7. Fidelissima primordii exempla. De limo caro in Adam. Quid aliud limus quam liquor opimus? Inde erit genitale virus. Ex afflatu dei anima. Quid aliud afflatus dei quam vapor spiritus? Inde erit quod per virus illud efflamus. 8. Cum igitur in primordio duo diversa atque divisa, limus et flatus, unum hominem coegissent, confusae substantiae ambae iam in uno semina quoque sua miscuerunt atque exinde generi propagando formam tradiderunt, ut et nunc duo, licet diversa, etiam unita pariter effluant pariterque insinuata sulco et arvo suo pariter hominem ex utraque substantia effruticent, in quo rursus semen suum insit secundum genus, sicut omni condicioni genitali praestitutum est. 9. Igitur ex uno homine tota haec animarum redundantia, observante scilicet natura dei edictum: *crescite et in multitudinem proficite*. Nam et in ipsa praefatione operis unius, faciamus hominem, universa posteritas pluraliter praedicata est: et praesint piscibus maris. Nihil mirum repromissio segetis in semine.

28. 1. Quis ille nunc vetus sermo apud memoriam Platonis de animarum reciproco discursu, quod hinc abeuntes sint illuc et rursus huc veniant et fiant et dehinc ita habeat rursus ex mortuis effici vivos? Pythagoricus, ut volunt quidam; divinum Albinus existimat, Mercurii forsitan Aegyptii. Sed nullus sermo divinus nisi dei unius, quo prophetae, quo apostoli, quo ipse Christus intonuit. Multo antiquior Moyses etiam Saturno, nongentis circiter annis, nedum pronepotibus eius, certe divinius multo, qui decursus generis humani ab exordio mundi quoque per singulas nativitates nominatim temporatimque

20. Gen. 1, 28. 22/3. Gen. 1, 26. 25. Plato Phaedo 70C.

2. quare corpus] qualē et corpus et *B* calet et corpus *Hartel ap. Rfd* calet corpus et *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,67* 4. periclitetur *Bmg* ultimo *Urs*

6. devirescimus *Bmg* 15. etiam] tamen *Rfd susp.* 19. redundantia, observante *Gel Iun*] redundantia observante, agitur *B* redundantia agitur, observante *Pam; Rig in Observ.* redundantia. Observante agitur *Lindn*

24. *distinctionem post mirum in omnibus editionibus obviam sustulit Th. St. T. 3, 29.* 25. ADVERSUS PLATONEM, NON EX MORTUIS FIERI VIVOS *B Gel* 26. sint *B Kroym. 109/10*] eant *Gel* 27. fiant *B*] fiant

ex vivis mortui *Kroym. 110* vivant *Gel* ita habeat *scripti*] ita habeant *B Kroym. 110* e vita abeant *Gel* 28. quidam; divinum Albinus existimat *Oehl*] quidam divinus Albinus (*Malbinus Bmg*) existimat *B* quidam divinus,

Albini, ut existimo, aut *Gel* quidam, divinus; Albini, ut existimo, aut *Iun* quin et divinus, ut Albinus existimat, aut *Urs* quidam; divinus, Albinus existimat, *Lindn* 29. Mercurii *B* unicus *Gomperz 70*

33. quosque *Iun*

digessit, satis probatus divinitatem operis ex divinatione vocis. 2. Si vero Samius sophista Platoni auctor est de animarum recidivatu revolubili semper ex alterna mortuorum atque viventium suffectione, certe ille Pythagoras, etsi bonus cetera, tamen ut hanc sententiam
 5 exstrueret, non turpi modo, verum etiam temerario mendacio incubuit. Cognosce, qui nescis, et crede nobiscum. Mortem simulat, subterraneo latitat, septennio illic patientiam damnat; interea quae de posteris defunctis ad fidem rerum esset relaturus ab unica conscia et ministra matre cognoscit. Ut satis sibi visus est corpulentiam interpolasse ad
 10 omnem mortui veteris horrorem, de adytis fallaciae emergit ut ab inferis redditus. 3. Quis non crederet revixisse quem crediderat obisse, audiens praesertim ab eo, quae de posteris mortuis nisi apud inferos non videretur cognoscere potuisse? Sic ex mortuis vivos effici senior sermo est. Quid enim, si et iunior? Neque veritas desiderat
 15 vetustatem neque mendacium devitat novellitatem. Teneo plane falsum, antiquitate generosum; quidni falsum, cuius testimonium quoque ex falso est? Quomodo credam non mentiri Pythagoran, qui mentitur, ut credam? Quomodo mihi persuadebit Aethalidem et Euphorbum et Pyrrhum piscatorem et Hermotimum se retro ante
 20 se Pythagoran fuisse, ut persuadeat vivos ex mortuis effici, qui iterum semel redisset in vitam quam totiens alius atque alius, tanto et in
 f. 141 durioribus fefellit, / qui molliora mentitus est. 4. Sed clipeum Euphorbi olim Delphis consecratum recognovit et suum dixit et de
 25 signis vulgo ignotis probavit'. Respice ad hypogeum eius et, si capit, crede. Nam qui talem commentus est stropham, cum iniuria bonae valetudinis, cum fraude vitae septennio ex cruciatae infra terram inedia ignavia umbra, cui tanti fuit fastidium caeli, quam non accesserit temeritatem, quam non temptaverit curiositatem, ut ad notam clipei
 30 illius perveniret? 5. Quid autem, si in historiis aliquibus occultioribus repperit? Quid, si defectae iam traditionis superstites aliquas famaе aurulas hausit? Quid, si ab aedituo redempta clam inspectione cognovit? Scimus etiam magiae licere explorandis occultis per cata-
 bolicos et paredros et pythonicos spiritus. Non enim et Pherecydes,
 35 Pythagorae magister, his forsitan artibus divinabat, ne dicam somnia-
 bat? Quid, si idem daemon in illo fuit qui et in Euphorbo res sanguinis gessit? Denique qui se Euphorbum ex argumento clipei probarat, cur neminem Troianorum commilitonum aequae recognovit? Nam et illi iam revixissent, si vivi ex mortuis fierent.

1. probans *Gel* 2. animarum de *Gel* 4. qui tamen *B*
 7. septenni se illic patientia *Gel* 18. Aethalidem] Ephalidem *B Gel*
 19. Hermotimum *Pam*] Hermippum *B Gel* se] si *B* 22. semel
Urs] semet *B*; *om. Gel* post alterum alius interrogationis signum ponit *Iun*
 23. qui molliora] ab his verbis redit *A* 25. hypogium *A* hypogaeum *Iun*
 31. reperit *Gel* 32. aedituo *A* 33. magiae] magos *Gel* magia *Lindn*
 magiam *Rfd Kroym.* 110 licere] elicere *B Gel*; approbat *Kroym.* 110
 dicere *Rfd lectionem traditam vindicat Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 93/5 per
 catabolicos *B*] per catabolicos *A*; approbat *Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 93/5 pro-
 catabolicos *Gel* per catabolicos *Rfd* 34. paredros *A* pirecydes *A*
 35. forsitan *B Gel* 37. cessit *A B* in euphorbum (*prius b eras.*) *A*

29. 1. Mortuos quidem ex vivis effici constat, non ideo tamen et ex mortuis vivos. Ab initio enim vivi priores, unde ab initio aequae mortui posteriores, non aliunde quam ex vivis. Illi habuerunt unde potius orirentur, dum ne ex mortuis. Isti non habuerunt unde magis deducerentur, nisi ex vivis. 2. Igitur si ab initio vivi non ex mortuis, cur postea ex mortuis? Defecerat ille, quicumque est origini fons? An formae paenituit? Et quomodo in mortuis salva est? Non, quia ab initio mortui ex vivis, idcirco semper ex vivis? / Aut enim in f. 141^v utraque parte forma initii perseverasset aut in utraque mutasset, ut si vivos ex mortuis postea fieri oportuerat, perinde oporteret etiam non ex vivis effici mortuos. 3. Si non peraequare deberet fides institutionis, (3.) non usquequaque contraria ex contrariis reformari alternant. Et nos enim opponemus contrarietates nati et innati, visualitatis et caecitatis, iuventae et senectae, sapientiae et insipientiae; nec tamen ideo innatum de nato provenire, quia contrarium ex contrario fiat, nec visualitatem iterum ex caecitate, quia de visualitate caecitas accidat, nec iuventam rursus de senecta revivescere, quia ex iuventae senecta marcescat, nec insipientiam ex sapientia denuo obtundi, quia de insipientia sapientia acuatur. 4. Haec et Albinus Platoni suo veritus subtiliter quaerit contrarietatum genera distinguere, quasi non et haec tam absolute in contrarietatibus posita sint quam et illa quae ad sententiam magistri sui interpretatur, vitam dico et mortem. Nec tamen ex morte vita reddatur, quia ex vita mors deferatur.

30. 1. Quid autem ad cetera respondebimus? Primo enim, si ex mortuis vivi, sicut mortui ex vivis, unus omnino et idem numerus semper haesisset omnium hominum, ille scilicet numerus qui primus vitam introisset. Priores enim mortuis vivi, dehinc mortui ex vivis et rursus ex mortuis vivi. Et dum hoc semper ex iisdem, ita totidem semper, qui ex iisdem. Nam neque plures aut pauciores exissent

2. et] sed *A* 3. post posteriores punctum ponit *Oehl* distinctionem post vivos tollunt *B Gel* hoc modo distinguentes: *B*: non aliunde . . . errentur. Dum ne . . . deducerentur, nisi ex vivis? *Gel*: non aliunde . . . proficiscerentur, dum ne . . . deducerentur. habuerant *B Gel* 4. potius orirentur *Rig*] potius orrentur *A* potius errentur *B* proficiscerentur *Gel* habuerint *B Gel* 5. nisi ex vivis *om. Gel* 6. origini *A*; vindicat *Lfst. Synt. 1,167*] originis *B Gel* 9. aut in] in aut in *A corr.* 10. ut *om. A*; approbat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,68* 11. etiam] iam *Iun dubitanter* vivis] visuis *A corr.* mortuos, si non, peraequare . . . institutionis *Lindn et Hartel ap. Rfd* mortuos; si non, nec peraequare . . . institutionis *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,67/8* 13. alternare *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,68 dubitanter* alternarent *F. Vollmer Thes. l. L. I: 1754, 25* 14. vis valitatis *A* insipientiae *A corr.* 15. ideo] idoneo *A* 16. visualitatem] cuius valitatem *A* quia de visualitate *om. A* 17. reviviscere *B Gel* 18. ex sapientia] insipientiam *A* 19. obtundi] obtendi *Gel*, alii obtrudi; legere malim obtundi' *Iun de]* ex *Gel* Haec] hic *Rfd* 22. ad sententiam *Bmg*] absentiam *A B* interpretatur *Iun*] interpretantur *A B Gel* 27. hesisset *A* hominum *om. A* 28. enim ex mortuis *B Gel* 29. et rursus ex mortuis vivi *om. A* hisdem *A*; isdem *Oehl* 30. isdem *A* nam *om. A*; *Hoppe Beitr. 154 dubitat. utrum nam delendum sit an non* pauciores *A*

- quam redirent. 2. Invenimus autem apud commentarios etiam humanarum antiquitatum paulatim humanum genus exuberasse, dum
- f. 142 Aborigines / vel vagi vel extorres vel gloriosi quique occupant terras, ut Scythae Parthicas, ut Temenidae Peloponnesum, ut Athenienses
- 5 Asiam, ut Phryges Italiam, ut Phoenices Africam, dum sollemnes etiam amigrationes, quas ἀποικίας vocant, consilio exonerandae popularitatis in alios fines examina gentis eructant. Nam et origines nunc in suis sedibus permanent et alibi amplius gentilitatem feneraverunt. 3. Certe quidem ipse orbis in promptu est cultior de die et
- 10 instructor pristino. Omnia iam pervia, omnia nota, omnia negotiosa, solitudines famosas retro fundi amoenissimi obliteraverunt, silvas arva domuerunt, feras pecora fugaverunt, harenae seruntur, saxa panguntur, paludes eliquantur, tantae urbes quantae non casae quondam. Iam nec insulae horrent nec scopuli terrent; ubique domus,
- 15 ubique populus, ubique respublica, ubique vita. 4. Summum testimonium frequentiae humanae: onerosi sumus mundo, vix nobis elementa sufficiunt, et necessitates artiores, et querellae apud omnes, dum iam nos natura non sustinet. Revera lues et fames et bella et voragines civitatum pro remedio deputanda, tamquam tonsura
- 20 insolescentis generis humani; et tamen, cum eiusmodi secures maximam mortalium vim semel caedant, nunquam restitutionem eius vivos ex mortuis reducentem post mille annos semel orbis expavit. Et hoc enim sensibile fecisset aequa vis amissionis et restitutionis, si vivi ex mortuis fierent. 5. Cur autem mille annis post et non statim
- 25 ex mortuis vivi, cum, si non statim supparetur quod erogatum, in totum absumi periclitetur praeveniente restitutionem defectione, quia
- f. 142^v nec pariasset commeatus hic vitae miliario tempori longe scilicet / brevior et ideo facilius ante extinguere quam redaccendi? Igitur quae hoc modo intercidisset, si vivi ex mortuis fierent, quando non
- 30 intercidit, non erit credendum vivos ex mortuis fieri.

1. redirent] redissent. neque plures aut pauliores exissent quam redirent *A* redissent *Rig* in *Observat*; lectionem redirent vindicat *Lfst.*
Krit. Apol. 99 autem *Gel*] etiam *AB* humanum *A*

3. ab origine *ABmg* 4. primum ut] aut *A* corr.
 scytae *A* corr. Particas (*p-A*) *AB* Parthicam *Urs*
 ut Temenidae Peloponnesum *om.* *A* Temenidae *Iun Scal*
 Menidae *B Gel* Amyclae *Urs* 5. Phryges *B* et Phoenices *AB*
 solennes *B Gel*, ut semper 6. migrationes *B Gel* ΑΠΟΙΚΙΑΣ *A*
 μετακίας *B* (ἀποικίας *Bmg*) *Gel* vocant *A*] appellant *B Gel*
 7. aborigines *Urs* 8. faeneraverunt *A* 13. panduntur *Wissowa ap.*
Rfd (coll. *Liv.* 21, 37, 3) tantae iam urbes *Urs* tantae urbes iam *Rig*
 14. scopoli *A* 16. humanae: onerosi *Iun primus distinxit* onerosi * *A*
 17. arctiores *Gel* quaerellae *A* querelae *B Gel* 18. sustineret *A*
 et voragines] et *del. Fr. Leo ap. Kroym.* 110 et ceterae voragines *Kroym.*
 110 20. insolescentis *Rig* 21. numquam *A* 22. Et hoc enim] hoc
 enim vel hoc etenim *Kroym.* 110 24. et non *om.* *A* 25. post vivi
 interrogationis signum ponit *Urs* erogatur *Urs* 26. periclitetur genus
 humanum *Kroym.* 111 27. parias set *A* parias, sed *B* miliario *A*
 29. quae] quia *Kroym.* 111 post intercidisset lacunam signat *Rfd* secundum
 quem haec fere interierunt: humani generis aetas

31. 1. Iam vero si ex mortuis vivi, utique singuli ex singulis. Singulorum ergo corporum animas ut singulas in singula corpora reverti oportuerat. Porro si et binae et trinae et quinae usque uno utero resumuntur, non erunt ex mortuis vivi, quia non singuli ex singulis. Et hoc autem modo primordii forma signatur, cum et nunc plures animae de una proferuntur. 2. Item cum varia aetate discedant animae, cur una revertuntur? Omnes enim ab infantia imbuuntur, qua infans revertatur. Quale est autem, ut senex defunctus infans revertatur? Si decrescit foris anima retrograda aetate, quanto magis erat ut progressior reverteretur mille post annis, certe vel coetanea suae mortis, ut aevum quod reliquisset iterum recepisset? 3. Sed etsi eadem semper revolverentur, licet non corporum quoque formas easdem, licet non factorum quoque sortes easdem, tamen vel ingeniorum et studiorum et affectionum pristinas proprietates secum referre deberent, quoniam temere eadem haberentur carentes his per quae eadem probarentur. Unde scias, inquis, an ita quidem fiat occulte, sed condicio miliarii aevi interimat facultatem recensendi, quia ignotae tibi revertuntur? Atquin scio non ita fieri, cum Pythagoran Euphorbum mihi opponis. 4. Ecce enim Euphorbum militarem et bellicam animam satis constat vel de ipsa gloria clipeorum consecratorum, Pythagoran vero tam residem et inbellem, ut proelia tunc Graeciae vitans Italiae maluerit quietem geometriae et astrologiae et musicae devotus, alienus studio et affectu Euphorbi. Sed et Pyrrhus ille fallendis piscibus agebat, / Pythagoras contra nec edendis, ut animalibus abstinens. Aethalides autem et Hermotimus fabam quoque in pabulis communibus inruerat, Pythagoras vero ne per fabalia quidem transeundum discipulis suis tradidit. 5. Quomodo ergo eadem animae recuperantur, quae nec ingeniis nec institutis iam nec victibus eadem probabuntur? Iam nunc de tanto Graeciae

2. anima *Seml* ut] et *Rfd susp.* 5. signatur *Bmg Gel*] singulatur *A B*
 [forte sigillatur; nihil muto] *Iun* 6. variaetate *A* decedant *Gel*
 7. qua infans revertatur *om. A* prius revertatur] revertitur
Iun mavult interrogationis signum post prius revertatur ponit *Lat*
 9. retro gradua *A* 11. interrogationis signum post recepisset
primus posuit Iun 12. aedem *A* eadem *Bmg* 13. licet non factorum
 quoque sortes easdem, tamen *Kroym. 111*] *om. A* licet non flatorum:
 tamen quoque fortes casam (causam *Scal*) *B Gel Scal* licet non flatorum:
 tamen *Iun* licet non staturam, tamen vel sortes easdem *Lindn* vel
del. Lindn 14. affectionum] adiectionum *B Gel* 15. aedem *A* his] iis
Lat 16. eadem *Lat*] aedem *A* eadem *B Gel* occulte] *A* 17. miliarii
Iun recensendi] reminiscendi *Rfd susp.* quia ignotae tibi *Rig*] quia
 ignota et ibi *A* quia ignorata et ibi *B Gel* qua ignorata et ibi *Pam* quia
 ignota et sibi *Mercerus* qua ignorata tibi *Iun* quia ignoratae tibi *Lindn*
 quia ignotae ibi *Rfd* qua ignotae tibi *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,68* 19. prius
 Euphorbum] *euporbum *A* Ecce enim Euphorbum *Iun*] ecce enim *A*
 ecce enim, Euphorbum mihi opponis, ecce enim Euphorbum *B Gel*
 20. consecrator *A* 22. graetiae *A* Graecae *Iun* in italiae *A*
 quiete *A* 24. fallendi *A corr.* nec edendis] recedendis *A*
 25. Aephalides *A B* Ephalides *Gel* Hermotimus *Paul. Leopardus*] *f. 143*
 ermippus *A* Hermippus *B Gel* 26. inruerat] invenerat *Rfd susp.* insuerat
Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,69 28. aedem *A* 29. vitibus *A corr.*
 gregis *A*

censu quattuor solae animae recensentur. Sed et quid utique de solo Graeciae censu, ut non ex omni gente et ex omni aetate ac dignitate, ex omni denique sexu, et metempsychosis et metensomatosis cotidie existant, cur solus Pythagoras alium atque alium se recognoscat, non et ego? 6. Aut si privilegium philosophorum est, et utique Graecorum, quasi non et Scythae et Indi philosophentur, cur neminem se retro meminit Epicurus, neminem Chrysippus, neminem Zeno, ne ipse quidem Plato, quem forsitan Nestorem credidissemus ob mella facundiae?

- 10 32. 1. Sed enim Empedocles, quia se deum delirarat, idcirco, opinor, dedignatus aliquem se heroum recordari, *thamnus et piscis* fui, inquit. Cur non magis et pepo, tam insulsus, et chamaeleon, tam inflatus? Plane ut piscis, ne aliqua sepultura conditiore putesceret, assum se maluit in Aetnam praecipitando. Atque
15 exinde in illo finita est metensomatosis, ut aestiva cena post assum. 2. Perinde igitur et hic dimicemus necesse est adversus portentosiores praesumptionem bestias ex hominibus et homines ex bestiis revolvem. Viderint thamni, licebit et lapathi, ne plus ridere quam docere cogamur. Dicimus animam humanam nullo modo in bestias posse
143^v 20 transferri, etiamsi secundum philosophos ex elementiciis substantiis / censetur. 3. Sive enim ignis anima, sive aqua, sive sanguis, sive spiritus, sive aer, sive lumen, recogitare debemus contraria quaeque singulis speciebus animalia; igni quidem ea quae rigent, colubros stelliones salamandras, etiam quaecumque de aemulo producentur
25 elemento, de aqua scilicet; perinde contraria aquae illa quae arida et exsuccida: denique siccitatibus gaudent lucustae papiliunculi chamaeleontes; item contraria sanguini quae carent purpura eius, cochleas vermiculos et maiorem piscium censum; spiritui vero contraria quae spirare non videntur, carentia pulmonibus et arteriis,

1. quattuor... 2. censu *om. A* 2. ut *del. Urs* et *del. B Gel* ae * tate *A* 3. prius et *om. A* metempsychosis etmetem * somatosis *A* μετεμψύχωσις et μετενσωμάτωσις *B Gel* μετεμψύχωσης et μετενσωμάτωσις *Rig* quotidie *A* 4. exsistant *A* interrogationis signum post existant *ponit Iun* 6. se] et *Leopold* meminere epicurus *A* 7. Zenone (e in ras. m. rec.) *A* ne *om. A* 9. facundie ex factumdie *A* 10. AD METEMPSYCHOSIS ET METENSOMATOSIS *A* ANIMAE METΕΜΨΥΧΩΣΙΣ & μετενσωμάτωσις *B* ADVERSUS PYTHAGORAE ET EMPEDOCLES OPINIONES DE METEMPSYCHOSI ET METENSOMATOSI *Gel* empedocles *A* qui *Leopold* 11. tamnus *A* 13. plane *A* sepultura conditiore putesceret *Urs* (patesceret secundum *Wouwer.*) sepultura conditio reputesceret *A B* sepulturae conditio reputesceret *Gel* sepulturae conditione putesceret *Mercerus* 14. Aethnam (a-A) *A B* 15. est *A*] sit *B Gel* fuit *Iun* 16. proinde *B* (perinde *Bmg*) demicemus *A* portensiores *A* (corr. i. mg.) 18. licet *Lat* et lapathi (vel bis elati) *Lat*] et lapathi *A B Gel* et lappae *Iun* et lapathi *Urs* et raptim *Rig* elabi *Lindn* et lapidi *Hartel ap. Rfd* Ne... 19., dicimus *Urs* distinguunt 20. substantiis *A* 21. censeretur *B Gel* tertium sive] sine *B* 23. quidem *om. A* 24. daemulo *A* 25. contra *A* aquae *Iun*] atque *A B Gel* utique *Urs* * arida * *A* 26. exsuccina *A* exuccida *B Gel* denique quae *Hartel ap. Rfd* et *Patr. Stud.* 4,69 locustae *B Gel* 28. cocleas *A*

culices formicas tineas et hoc genus minutalia; item aeri contraria quae semper subterraneum et subaquaneum vivencia carent haustu eius (res magis quam nomina noveris); item contraria lumini quae caeca in totum vel solis tenebris habent oculos, talpas vesperugines noctuas. Haec ut ex apparentibus et manifestis substantiis doceam. 5
4. Ceterum si et atomos Epicuri tenerem et numeros Pythagorae viderem et ideas Platonis offenderem et entelechias Aristotelis occuparem, invenirem fors his quoque speciebus animalia quae nomine contrarietatis opponerem. Contendo enim ex quacumque substantia supra dicta constitisset humana anima, non potuisse eam in tam 10 contraria unicuique substantiae animalia reformari et censum eis de sua translatione conferre, a quibus excludi ac respui magis haberet quam admitti et capi nomine huius primae contrarietatis, quae substantivi status diversitatem committit, tunc et reliquae per consequentem ordinem / cuiusque naturae. 5. Nam et sedes alias humana anima 15 f. 144 sortita est et victus et instructus et sensus et affectus et concubitus et fetus, item ingenia, tum opera gaudia taedia vitia cupidines voluptates valetudines medicinas, suos postremo et vitae modos et exitus mortis. 6. Quomodo igitur illa anima quae terris inhaerebat, nullius sublimitatis, nullius profunditatis intrepida, ascensu etiam 20 scalarum fatigabilis, submersu etiam piscinarum strangulabilis, aeri postea insultabit in aquila aut mari postea desultabit in anguilla? Quomodo item pabulis liberalibus et delicatis atque curatis educata, non dico paleas, sed spinas et agrestes amaritudines frondium et bestias sterquiliniorum, verum etiam venena ruminabit, si in capram 25 transierit vel in coturnicem, immo et cadaverinam, immo et humanam, sui utique memor, in urso et leone? Sic et cetera ad incongruentiam rediges. Ne singulis perorandis immoremur, ipsius animae humanae quisquis modus, quaecumque mensura, quid faciet in amplioribus longe vel minutoribus animalibus? Necesse est enim et corpus omne 30 anima compleri et animam omnem corpore obduci. Quomodo ergo anima hominis complebit elephantum? Quomodo item obducetur in culice? Si tantum extendetur aut contrahetur, profecto periclitabitur. 7. Et ideo adicio: si nulla ratione capax est huiusmodi translationis in animalia nec modulis corporum nec ceteris naturae suae legibus 35 adaequantia, numquid ergo demutabitur secundum qualitates generum et vitam eorum contrariam / humanae vitae, facta et ipsa contraria f. 144^v humanae per demutationem? Enimvero si demutationem capit

2. per subterraneum *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,69* 3. noverim
Bmg Gel item] itāe *A* contraa *A corr.* 5. sub-
stanciis *A* 6. atomo *sepicuri A* numero *spytagorae*
A (h add.) 10. eam] iam *A Bmg* 13. prime *A*
21. scalarum...etiam *om. A* 22. anguilla *A corr.* 25. sterquiliniorum *ex*
sterquiliniorum *A* verum *scripsi]* vermium *A B (v., B), vermium Gel*
verum etiam] verminantium, et *Iun* venenarum inabit *A B* 26. prius
et *om. A* cadaverinam carnem *Rfd susp.* 27. Sic et] si *A* 28. redige
Seml 28. ipse *A* 30. et *om. A* 31. corpori *A Bmg*
32. obduceretur *A* 33. extenderetur *B Gel* contrahetur *Urs]* contra-
heretur *A B Gel* 34. si] quod *Gel* 36. anaquantia *A*
demu * * tabitur *A* 37. contrarium/contrarium *A* 38. enimvero si
demutationem *om. A*

amittens quod fuit, non erit quae fuit; et si quae fuit non erit, soluta est metensomatosi, non adscribenda scilicet ei animae quae, si demutabitur, non erit. Illius enim metensomatosi dicetur quaecumque eam in suo statu permanendo pateretur. 8. Igitur si nec mutari potest, ne non sit ipsa, nec permanere in statu, quia contraria non capit, quaero adhuc causam aliquam fide dignam huiusmodi translationis. Nam etsi quidam homines bestiis adaequantur pro qualitatibus morum et ingeniorum et affectuum, quia et deus: assimilatus est, inquit, homo in rationalibus iumentis, non ideo milvi ex rapacibus fient et canes ex spurcis et pantherae ex acerbis aut oves ex probis et hirundines ex garrulis et columbae ex pudicis, quasi eadem substantia animae ubique naturam suam in animalium proprietatibus repetat. Aliud est autem substantia, aliud natura substantiae, siquidem substantia propria est rei cuiusque, natura vero potest esse communis. 9. Suscipe exemplum. Substantia est lapis, ferrum; duritia lapidis et ferri natura substantiae est. Duritia communicat, substantia discordat. Mollitia lanae, mollitia plumae: pariant naturalia earum, substantiva non pariant. Sic et, si saeva bestia vel proba vocetur homo, sed non eadem anima: nam et tunc naturae similitudo notatur, cum substantiae dissimilitudo conspicitur. Ipsum enim quod hominem similem bestiae iudicas, confiteris animam non eandem, similem dicendo, non ipsam. 10. Sic et divina pronuntiatio sapit, pecudibus adaequans hominem / natura, non substantia. Ceterum nec deus hominem hoc modo notasset et ipse, si pecudem de substantia nosset.

33. 1. Etiam cum iudicii nomine vindicatur hoc dogma, quod animae humanae pro vita et meritis genera animalium sortiantur, iugulandae quaeque in occisoriis et subigendae quaeque in famulatoriis et fatigandae in operariis et foedandae in immundis, perinde honorandae et diligendae et curandae et appetendae in speciosissimis et probissimis et utilissimis et delicatissimis, et hic dicam: si demutantur, non ipsae dispungentur quae merebuntur. 2. Evacuabitur ratio

8. Ps. 48, 21.

1. non erit quae fuit *om. A* 2/3. μετεσσωμάτωσις *B Gel*
 3. non erit quae fuit *Rfd*; quem refutat *Gomperz 70* 5. quia] qui *Rfd susp.* 8. adsimulatus *B Gel* 9. in rationalibus *B* irrationalibus *Pam* 11. aut oves ex probis *om. A* garrulis *A* (*r deterum*) 15. suspice *Seml* 18. saev abestia *A* 19. vel proba *om. A*; quod probant *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,70 et Kroym. 112* ut homo *Rfd susp.* (*contra quem Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,70*) et homo *Kroym. 112* 21. ipsud *A* 22. eandem, similem *Lat. distinguit*] eandem similem, similem *B Gel* virgulam post dicendo tollit *Kroym. 112* pronuntiatio *A* 23. adhaequans *A* 24. et ipse, si *Th. Eran. 7 (1907), 95/6*] et ipsi *A* si *B Gel* ut ipse *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,70* 25. de] eadem de *Rfd susp.*; quem refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,70* nosse *A* 27. pro vita meritis *A corr.* 29. proinde *B Gel* 30. et diligendae *om. A* spetiosissimis *A* 31. delectatissimis *B* (delicatissimis *Bmg*) 32. non ipsae dispungentur *om. A* Et evacuabitur *B Gel*

iudicii, si meritorum deerit sensus. Deerit autem sensus meritorum, si status verterit animarum. Vertit autem status animarum, si non eadem perseveraverint. Aequae si perseveraverint in iudicium, quod et Mercurius Aegyptius novit, dicens animam digressam a corpore non refundi in animam universi, sed manere determinatam, uti rationem, inquit, patri reddat eorum quae in corpore gesserit, volo iudicii utique divini iustitiam gravitatem maiestatem dignitatem recensere, si non sublimiore fastigo praesidet humana censura, plenior utriusque sententiae honore, poenarum et gratiarum, severior in ulciscendo et liberalior in largiendo. 3. Quid putas futuram animam homicidae? Aliquod, credo, pecus lanienae et macello destinatum, ut perinde iuguletur, quia et ipsa iugulaverit, perinde decorietur, quia et ipsa despoliaverit, perinde in pabulum proponatur, quia et ipsa bestiis fecerit eos quos in silvis et aviis trucidaverit. 4. Si ita iudicabitur, nonne illa anima plus solacii quam supplicii relatura est, quod funus inter cocos pretiosissimos invenit, quod condimentis Apicianis et Lurconianis humatur, quod mensis Ciceronianis inferitur, quod lancibus splendidissimis Sullanis effertur, quod exsequias / convivium patitur, f. 145^v quod a coaequalibus devoratur potius quam a milvis et lupis, ut in hominis corpore tumultata et in suum genus regressa resurrexisse videatur, exsultans adversus humana iudicia, si ea experta est? 5. Namque illa sicarium variis et exquisitis et iam praeter naturam eruditis feris dissipant, et quidem viventem, immo facile nec morientem curata mora finis ad plenitudinem poenae. Sed et si anima praefugerit ultimo gladio, ne corpus quoque evaserit ferrum, nihilominus iugulo utroque confossis costisque transfixis compensatio proprii facinoris exigitur. Inde in ignem datur, ut et sepultura puniatur. Aliter denique non licet. Nec tamen tanta est rogi cura, ut reliquias aliae bestiae inveniant; certe nec ossibus parcitur nec cineribus

1. si om. B meritum A deerit sensus... sensus meritorum om. A 2. vertit... animarum om. A 3. aedem ex caedam A prius perseveraverint] perseverant A Aequae si perseveraverint del. Wissowa ap. Rfd aequae si perseverant. Viderit iudicium Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,72 aequae si non Urs atque si Rfd susp. post iudicium punctum ponit Rig 5. in animam universi om. A 6. post gesserit punctum ponit Gel, punctum cum virgula Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,72 7. recense Gel 8. post non virgulam ponit Iun pleno Bmg 9. poenarum] poenarum et sententiarum B siverior A 12. iuguletur... perinde om. A 14. fecerit AB; cf. Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,72] infecerit Gel obiecerit Urs iecerit Rfd susp. eos quos] os, quas Gel aviis] arvis B Gel 15. quam supplicii om. A 16. coccus B Gel, cocos... vel coquos Iun crocos La Cerda susp. preciosissimos A praetiosissimos B 17. lurchonianis A alterum quoda... 18. effertur om. A 18. Syllanis B Gel 19. aco aequalibus A 21. expar tast A 22. etiam A B Gel preter A 23. facile nec A vindicat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,72/3] nec facile B Gel 24. curatam ora A pene A 25. virgulam post ferrum primus posuit v. d. Vliet 90/1 nihilominus A 26. utroque A B Gel] ventrequ Lat viroque (= partibus genitalibus) Rig in Observ. utroque Scal latereque Rfd confosso Urs 27. propria v. d. Vliet 90 susp. Inde] inde nec Kroym. 112/3 hoc modo distinguens: ut... puniatur (aliter... cura), ut... inveniant; contra quem disputat Gomperz 71 28. ut] ut ne Rfd susp. 29. inveniant] non inveniant v. d. Vliet 91/2; Gomperz 71 pascitur A

indulgetur nuditate plectendis. 6. Tanta est apud homines
homicidii vindicta quanta ipsa quae vindicatur natura. Quis
non praeferat saeculi iustitiam, quam et apostolus non
frustra gladio armatam contestatur, quae pro homine saeviendo
5 religiosa est? Si ceterorum quoque scelerum mercedem cogitemus,
patibula et vivicomburia et culleos et uncas et scopulos, cui
non expediat apud Pythagoran et Empedoclen sententiam pati?
7. Nam et qui laboribus atque servitiis puniendi in asinos utique et
mulos reincorporabuntur, quantum sibi de pistrinis et aequilegis rotis
10 gratulabuntur, si metallorum et ergastulorum et operum publicorum
ipsorumque carcerum, licet otiosorum, recordentur! Perinde
qui integre morati commendaverint iudici vitam, quaero praemia,
sed potius invenio supplicia. Nimirum magna merces bonis in animalia
f. 146 quaecumque restitui. / 8. Pavum se meminit Homerus Ennio som-
15 nante; sed poetis nec vigilantibus credam. Et si pulcherrimus pavus
et quo velit colore cultissimus, sed tacent pennae, sed displicet vox,
et poetae nihil aliud quam cantare malunt. Damnatus est igitur
Homerus in pavum, non honoratus. Plus de saeculi remuneratione
gaudebit, pater habitus liberalium disciplinarum, ut malit famae
20 suae ornamenta quam caudae. 9. Age nunc, ut poetae in pavos vel
in cynos transeant, si vel cynis decora vox est, quod animal indues
viro iusto Aeaco? Quam bestiam integrae feminae Didoni? Quam
volucrem patientia, quam pecudem sanctimonia, quem piscem inno-
centia sortientur? Omnia famula sunt hominis, omnia subiecta, omnia
25 mancipata. Si quid horum futurus est, diminoratur illic ille cui ob
merita vitae imagines, statucae et tituli, honores publici, privilegia
rependuntur, cui curia, cui populus suffragiis immolat. 10. O iudicia
divina post mortem humanis mendaciora, contemptibilia de poenis,
fastidibilia de gratiis, quae nec pessimi metuant nec optimi cupiant,
30 ad quae magis scelesti quam sancti quique properabunt, illi, ut
iustitiam saeculi citius evadant, isti, ut tardius eam capiant! Bene
philosophi docetis, utiliter suadetis, leviora post mortem supplicia
vel praemia, cum, si quod iudicium animas manet, gravius debet
credi in disputatione vitae quam in administratione, quia nihil

3. Rom. 13, 4.

4. armata Gel (laps. preh, ut videtur) 6. primum et om. Gel
7. phytagoran A 9. pristinis A B 10. et ergastulorum
om. A publicorum ipsorumque] publicorumque A 11. prinde
A proinde B 13. mertes A 16. post cultissimus interrogationis
signum ponit Rfd quem refutant Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,73; v. d. Vliet 91
pennae B Gel 18. non om. A B (al. non honoratus' Bmg) Gomperz 72
qui distinguit: damnatus . . . pavum, honoratus . . . remuneratione: gaudebit,
pater . . . disciplinarum, ut . . . caudae. 20. caudae. Age Mercerus; Petr.
Ciacconius] gaude age A gaudeat. age B Gel caudae. At age Scal gaudia.
at age Urs poete A 22. Aeaco Urs] deloco A de loco B Deloco Gel
Deiocae P. Leopardus Emendat. VIII, 3 Deioei Lat femine A
23. pacientia A 25. diminoratur Iun 26. et om. A 28. mendiciora
Pam; approbat Kroyrn. 113 contemptibilia A 29. prius nec] n & A
30. ad quae Mercerus] at quae A atque B Gel ad quem Mercerus sec. Oehl
(unde?) 31. ea Kroyrn. 113 33. debet A; cf. Hoppe Beitr. 32.] debeat B Gel

plenius quam quod extremius, nihil autem extremius quam quod divinius. 11. Deus itaque iudicabit plenius, quia extremius, per sententiam aeternam tam supplicii quam refrigerii / nec in bestias, f. 146^v sed in sua corpora revertentibus animabus, et hoc semel et in eum diem quem solus pater novit, ut pendula expectatione sollicitudo 5 fidei probetur, semper diem observans, dum semper ignorat, cotidie timens, quod cotidie sperat.

34. 1. Nulla quidem in hodiernum dementiae huiusmodi sententia erupit sub nomine haeretico, quae humanas animas refingat in bestias, sed necessarie hanc quoque speciem intulimus et exclusimus ut superioribus cohaerentem, quo perinde in pavo retunderetur Homerus sicut in Pythagora Euphorbus atque ita hac etiam metempsychosi sive metensomatosi percussa illa rursus caederetur quae aliquid haereticis sumministravit. 2. Nam et Simon Samarites in actis apostolorum redemptor spiritus sancti, posteaquam damnatus ab ipso cum pecunia 15 sua in interitum frustra flevit, conversus ad veritatis expugnationem quasi pro solacio ultionis, fultus etiam artis suae viribus, ad praestigias virtutis alicuius Helenam quandam Tyriam de loco libidinis publicae eadem pecunia redemit, dignam sibi mercedem pro spiritu sancto; 3. et ae quidem fingit summum patrem, illam vero iniectionem suam 20 primam, qua iniecerat angelos et archangelos condere; huius eam propositi compotem exilisse de patre et in inferiora desultasse atque illic praevento patris proposito angelicas potestates genuisse ignaras patris, artifices mundi huius; ab his non perinde animo retentam, ne digressa ea alterius genimina viderentur, et idcirco omni contumeliae addictam, / ut nusquam discedere depretiatam liberet, f. 147 humanae quoque formae succidisce velut vinculis carnis coercendam; 4. ita multis aavis per alios ad alios habitus femininos volutatam

4. Mtth. 24, 36 (Marc. 13, 32).

14. Act. ap. 8, 18 seqq.

1. *rasuram ante prius extremius exhibet A alterum extremius Th. Eran.*
 7 (1907), 96/7] plenius *A B Gel* 8. nec *vix legibile in A*
 4. *virgulam post animabus primus posuit Iun alterum et om. A*
 6. cotidie *Rfd*] quotidie *A B Gel* 7. cotidie *A*] quotidie *B Gel*
 8. ADVERSUS OPINIONEM SIMONIS HERETICI (HAE — *Gel*) *A B Gel*
 ad hodiernum *B Gel* sententię rupit *A* 9. sub] suo *A*
 revincat *Bmg* 10. necessarię *A* necessario *Rig*, 11. pavo retunderetur *A*] pavone tunderetur *B Gel* pavo tunderetur *Seml* 12. euphorbus *A*
 14. subministravit *B Gel* hactis *A* 15. ab ipso] a Petro aut ab Apto' *Mercerus* ab apostolo *Rfd Kroym. 113*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Gomperz 72*
 16. in interitum *A*; approbat *Kroym. 113*] interitum *B Gel* 17. solatio *A*
 praestigias *A* 18. Helenam *Rig*] helenen *A* Helenem *B Gel* aut legendum Helenem aut ... (quod malim) Helenam' *Iun* locis *A*
 19. mercem *Rig in Observat.* 20. finxit *Lat* 21. qua] quam *Rfd* et archangelos om. *A* 22. exsilisse *B Gel* 24. patris, artifices *Hilgenfeld Ketzergesch.² 180₂₉₄*] patris artificis *A B Gel* iis *Lat* non perinde animo (animo ex animam *A*) *A B Gel Rfd* (crucem ante non ponens)] perinde animo *Pam* vero per invidiam *Lat* (ex *Iren. 1,23*) compari inde animo *Oehl* non prompto animo *Lindn* propter invidiam *Kellner 343*, non pio quidem animo *Rfd susp.* non pio perinde animo *Hartel ap. Rfd* 25. ea alterius] ex alterius *A B* ea alter *Bmg* 26. nunquam *Bmg*
 27. succedisce *A* 28. multi saevis *A*

- etiam illam Helenam fuisse exitiosissimam Priamo et Stesichori postea oculis, quem excaecasset ob convicium carminis, dehinc reluminasset ob satisfactionem laudis; proinde migrantem eam de corporibus in corpora postrema dedecoratione sub titulo prostituisse
- 5 Helenam viliorē. Hanc igitur esse ovem perditam, ad quam descenderit pater summus, Simon scilicet, et primum recuperata ea et revecta, nescio umeris an feminibus, exinde ad hominum respexerit salutem quasi per vindictam liberandorum ex illis angelicis potestatibus, quibus fallendis et ipse configuratus aequae et hominibus hominem
- 10 ementitus in Iudaea quidem filium, in Samaria vero patrem gesserit. 5. O Helenam inter poetas et haereticos laborantem, tunc adulterio, nunc stupro infamem, nisi quod de Troia gloriosius eruitur quam de lupanari, mille navibus de Troia, nec mille denariis forsitan de lupanari. Erubescere, Simon, tardior in requirendo, inconstantior in retrahendo.
- 15 At Menelaus statim insequitur amissam, statim repetit ereptam, decenni proelio extorquet, non latens, non fallens, non cavillabundus. Vereor, ne ille magis pater fuerit qui circa Helenae recuperationem et vigilantius et audentius et diutius laboraverit.

35. 1. Sed non tibi soli metempsychosis hanc fabulam instruxit: inde etiam Carpocrates utitur, pariter magus, pariter fornicarius, etsi Helena minus. Quidni? cum propter omnimodam divinae et humanae disciplinae eversionem constituendam re incorporari animas asseveraverit; nulli enim vitam istam ratio fieri, / nisi universis quae arguunt eam expunctis, quia non natura quid malum habeatur, sed opinione.
- f. 147^v 25 Itaque metempsychosin necessarie imminere, si non in primo quoque vitae huius commeatu omnibus illicitis satisfiat (scilicet facinora tributa sunt vitae!), ceterum totiens animam revocari habere quotiens minus quid intulerit, reliquatricem delictorum, donec exsolvat novissimum quadrante detrusa identidem in carcerem
- 30 corporis. 2. Huc enim temperat totam illam allegoriam domini certis interpretationibus relucens et primo quidem simpliciter intellegendam. Nam et ethnicus homo adversarius noster est, incedens in eadem via vitae communis. Ceterum oportebat nos de mundo exire, si cum

28. Mtth. 5, 26. 33. 1 Cor. 5, 10.

2. et excaecasset *B Gel* 3. satis factionem *A* 4. postremo dedecoratiore *Urs* 5. Helena *Rfd susp.* 6. patrem *A*
 7. humeris *A corr. B Gel* respexit *Pam* 9. et hominibus *A B* hominibus et *Gel* 10. ementitus] & mentitus *A corr.* se gesserit *Rfd quem refutat Lfst. Spr. Tert. 50* 11. et] *het A corr.* sed *B*
 13. prius mille... lupanari *om. A* 14. trahendo *A* 15. statim... amissam *om. A* repetit] perpetit *A* 16. decennii *B Gel* cavellabundus *A* 18. exaudentius *A* 19. AD (ADVERSUS *Gel*) CARPOCRATIS OPINIONEM *A B Gel* 20. etsi... 21. Quidni?], praestat includi notis parentheses *Iun* 22. adseveraverit *B Gel* 24. quia] qua *Seml* 25. necessarię *A* 30. allegoriam *B Gel*
 31. intellegendum *A* 32. et *om. A* incaedens *A* in *del. Rig*
 eandem *Rig* 33. viam *A Rig*

illis conversari non liceret. Huic ergo boni animi praestes iubet (diligite enim inimicos vestros, inquit, et orate pro maledicentibus vos), ne aliquo commercio negotiorum iniuria provocatus abstrahat te ad suum iudicem, et ad custodiam delegatus ad exsolutionem totius debiti arteris. 3. Tum si in diabolum transfertur adversarii mentio ex observatione comitante, cum illo quoque moneris eam inire concordiam quae deputetur ex fidei conventionione; pactus es enim renuntiasse ipsi et pompae et angelis eius. Convenit inter vos de isto. Haec erit amicitia observatione sponsionis, ne quid eius postea resumas ex his quae eierasti, quae illi reddidisti, ne te ut fraudatorem, ut pacti transgressorem iudici deo obiciat, sicut eum legimus alibi sanctorum criminatorem et de ipso etiam nomine diaboli delatorem, et iudex te tradat angelo executionis, et ille te in carcerem mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris, nisi modico quoque delicto mora resurrectionis expenso. Quid his sensibus aptius? Quid his interpretationibus verius? 4. Ceterum ad Carpocraten: si omnium / facinorum debitor anima est, quis erit inimicus et adversarius eius intellegendus? Credo, mens melior, quae illam in aliquid innocentiae inpegerit adigendam rursus ac rursus in corpus, donec in nullo rea deprehendatur bonae vitae. Hoc est ex malis fructibus bonam arborem intellegi, id est, ex pessimis praeceptis doctrinam veritatis agnoscere. 5. Spero huiusmodi haereticos Heliae quoque invadere exemplum, tamquam in Iohanne sic repraesentati, ut metempsychosi patrocinetur pronuntiatio domini: Helias iam venit, et non cognoverunt eum, et alibi: et si vultis audire, hic est Helias, qui venturus est. Numquid ergo et Iudaei ex opinione Pythagorica consulebant Iohannem: tu es Helias? et non ex praedicatione divina: et ecce mittam vobis Helian Thesbitem? 6. Sed enim metempsychosis illorum revocatio est animae iam pridem morte functae et in aliud corpus iteratae, (6) Helias autem non ex decessione vitae, sed ex translatione venturus est, nec corpori restituendus, de quo non est

2. Mtth. 5, 44 (Luc. 6, 27). 3. Mtth. 5, 25/6 (Luc. 12, 58/9).
 11. Mtth. 5, 25/6 (Luc. 12, 58/9). 12. Apoc. 12, 10. 24. Mtth. 17, 12.
 25. Mtth. 11, 14. 27. Joh. 1, 21. 28. Mal. 4, 5.

1. boni *A*; *approbant Gomperz 73; Th. St. T. 3,33/4* bonum *B Gel*
 praestes] praesto esto *Gomperz 73* praesto es(se) *Stowasser ap.*
Gomperz 73; lectionem traditam vindicat Th. St. T. 3,33/4 iubet *om. A*
 2. enim *om. A* et *om. Gel* 3. commertio *A*
 4. in custodiam *B Gel* 5. exsolutionem *A* 6. comitantem
Gomperz 74 8. renuntiasse *A* renuntiare *B Gel* 9. de
 observatione *Rfd susp.* observatio *Bmg* 10. ei eierasti *B Gel*
 eie reddidisti (eie inductum) *A* 12. sicuti *Pam* 13. diaboli *om. A*
 executionis *B Gel* 16. ad *A*; *approbat Lfst. Z. Spr. T. 87; sed cf. comm.]*
apud B Gel Carpocratem *Gel* 18. mens] meus *B* aliquid inno-
 centiae] aliud quid nocentiae *Rfd susp.* 23. sic *om. A* 24. patrocinentur
 praenuntio *A* 26. nunquid *A* 27. pythagorica *A* 28. predicatione *A*
 29. Heliam *B Gel* interrogationis signum post Thesbitem primus posuit *Iun*

exemptus, sed mundo reddendus, de quo est translatus, non ex postliminio vitae, sed ex supplemento prophetiae, idem et ipse, et sui nominis et sui hominis. Sed quomodo Helias Johannes? Habes angeli vocem: et ipse, inquit, praecedet coram populo in
 5 virtute et in spiritu Heliae, non in anima eius nec in carne. Hae enim substantiae sui cuiusque sunt hominis, spiritus vero et virtus extrinsecus conferuntur ex dei gratia; ita et transferri in alterum possunt ex dei voluntate, ut factum est retro de Mosei spiritu.

36. 1. In has quaestiones inde, opinor, excessimus quo nunc
 10 revertendum est. Constitueramus animam in ipso et ex ipso seri
 f. 148^v homine et unum esse a primordio / semen, sicut et carnis, in totum generis examen, propter aemulas scilicet opiniones philosophorum et haereticorum et illum sermonem Platonis veterosum. Nunc ordinem sequentium exinde tractatum teximus. 2. Anima in utero seminata
 15 pariter cum carne pariter cum ipsa sortitur et sexum, ita pariter, ut in causa sexus neutra substantia teneatur. Si enim in seminibus utriusque substantiae aliquam intercapedinem eorum conceptus admitteret, ut aut caro aut anima prior seminaretur, esset etiam sexus proprietatem alteri substantiae adscribere per temporalem
 20 intercapedinem seminum, ut aut caro animae aut anima carni insculperet sexum, 3. quoniam et Apelles, non pictor, sed haereticus, ante corpora constituens animas viriles ac muliebres, sicut a Philumena didicit, utique carnem ut posteriorem ab anima facit accipere sexum. Et qui animam post partum carni superducunt utique ante formatae,
 25 marem aut feminam de carne sexum praeiudicant animae. 4. Utriusque autem substantiae indiscreta semina et unita suffusio eorum communem subeunt generis eventum, qua lineas duxerit quaecumque illa est ratio naturae. Certe et hic se primordiorum forma testatur, cum masculus temperius effingitur (prior enim Adam), femina ali-
 30 quanto serius (posterior enim Eva). Ita diu caro informis est, qualis ex Adae latere decerpta est, animal tamen et ipsa iam, quia et illam tunc Adae portionem animam agnoscam. Ceterum et ipsam dei afflatus animasset, si non ut carnis, ita et animae ex Adam tradux fuisset in femina.

4. Luc. 1, 17. 8. Num. 11, 17. 29/30. 1 Tim. 2, 13.

1. expost liminio *A* 5. et sup. vers. *A* primum in om. *A*
 6. haec *B Gel* 8. dei] fidei *Bmg* Mosis *Rig* 9. DE
 SEXU ANIMAE ET CARNIS (CARNIS ET ANIMAE *A*) PARITER
 ORIENTE *A B* DE SEXU ANIMAE ET CARNIS QUOD SIMUL IN
 UTERO FORMENTUR *Gel* 16. alterum in om. *A B* 17. in aliquam *A B*
 intercapedinem *A* 18. aut anima] ut anima *A* 20. intercapedinem *A*
 21. quoniam] quomodo *Rfd susp.* 22. mulieres *A* a] ad *A* ab *Rig*
 Philomena *B Gel* 23. in carnem *B* 24. carni superducunt] carnis
 ducunt *A* virgulam ante voces utique ante formatae ponit *Gel* 25. femi-
 nam *A* 26. discreta *A B* (indiscreta *Bmg*) unitas effusio *A*
 28. certę *A* 29. temporius *Gel* 30. diu] quamdiu *Rfd* dum *Hartel ap.*
Rfd diutius *Kroym.* 113 31. Adae om. *A* 32. animam *A B*; vindicat
Th. St. T. 2,33] animal *Gel* animatam *Urs* 34. faemina *A*

37. 1. Omnem autem hominis in utero serendi struendi fingendi paraturam / aliqua utique potestas divinae voluntatis ministra modu- f. 149
latur, quamcumque illam rationem agitare sortita. Haec aestimando
etiam superstitio Romana deam finxit Alemonam alendi in utero
fetus et Nonam et Decimam a sollicitioribus mensibus et Partulam, 5
quae partum gubernet, et Lucinam, quae producat in lucem. Nos
officia divina angelos credimus. 2. Ex eo igitur fetus in utero homo,
a quo forma completa est. Nam et Mosei lex tunc aborsus reum talioni-
bus iudicat, cum iam hominis est causa, cum iam illi vitae et mortis 10
status deputatur, cum et fato iam inscribitur, etsi adhuc in matre
vivendo cum matre plurimum communicat sortem. 3. Dicam aliquid
et de temporibus animae nascentis, ut ordinem decurram. Legitima
nativitas ferme decimi mensis ingressus est. Qui numeros ratiocinantur,
et decuriale numerum ut exinde reliquorum parentem colunt, 15
denique perfectorem nativitatis humanae. 4. Ego ad deum potius
argumentabor hunc modum temporis, ut decem menses decalogo
magis inaugurent hominem, ut tanto temporis numero nascamur
quanto disciplinae numero renascimur. Sed et cum septimo mense
nativitas plena est facilius quam octavo, honorem sabbati agnoscam,
ut quo die dedicata est dei conditio, eo mense interdum producat 20
dei imago. Concessum est properare nativitati et tamen idonee
occurrere in hebdomadem, in auspicia resurrectionis et requietis et
regni. Ideo ogdoas nos non creat; tunc enim nuptiae non erunt.
5. Societatem carnis atque animae iamdudum commendavimus a
congregatione seminum ipsorum usque ad figmenti perfectionem; 25
perinde nunc et a nativitate defendimus, inprimis quod simul crescunt,
sed divisa ratione / pro generum condicione, caro modulo, anima f. 149^v
ingenio, caro habitu, anima sensu. Ceterum animam substantia
crescere negandum est, ne etiam decrescere substantia dicatur atque
ita et defectura credatur; sed vis eius, in qua naturalia peculia consita 30
retinentur, salvo substantiae modulo, quo a primordio inflata est,
paulatim cum carne producitur. 6. Constitue certum pondus auri
vel argenti, rudem adhuc massam: collectus habitus est illi et futuro
interim minor, tamen continens intra lineam moduli totum quod

8. Ex. 21, 22. 23. Mtth. 22, 30. 29. ne etiam ... p. 54, 9
provocativa: adducit Aug. gen. ad litt. 10, 25, 40.

1. DE AETATE ANIMAE (CARNIS ET ANIMAE Gel) A B Gel figendi A
2. divine ex divinę A 3. quamcumque] alii quaecumque' Iun illa
Urs; *damnat Kroym. 113* Haec] hoc A estimando A 4. alendis ...
fetibus Rfd susp. 5. sollicitioribus A 8. Moysi B Gel Moysei
Scal Moysis Urs 9. hominis ... illi om. A 10. et om. A
etsi] de sic Iun 12. ut om. A ordine A 14. parentum Gel
16. de decalogo Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,73/4; *damnat Gomperz 74*
18. renascimur] nascimur A 19. nativitatis Rig 20. quoto Gel
est om. B Gel eo] toto B Gel 21. conces sum A tam Rig
idonee] ideo ne A B 22. ebdomadem A hebdomaden B
24. sotietatem A 25. congregatione A Bmg] concrectione
B Gel 26. proinde B Gel a nativitate] nativitatem A
27. diversa B Gel 29. decrescere] crescere A adque A 30. qua
naturalia] quantunaturalia A qua intus naturalia susp. Hartel ap. Rfd et
Patr. Stud. 4,74 pecunia A corr. 31. retinetur A

natura est auri vel argenti. Dehinc cum in laminam massa laxatur, maior efficitur initio suo per dilatationem ponderis certi, non per adiectionem, dum extenditur, non, dum augetur; etsi sic quoque augetur, dum extenditur: licet enim habitu augetur, cum statu non
 5 licet. 7. Tunc et splendor ipse provehitur auri vel argenti, qui fuerat quidem et in massa, sed obscurior, non tamen nullus. Tunc et alii atque alii habitus accedunt pro facilitate materiae, qua duxerit eam qui aget, nihil conferens modulo nisi effigiem. Ita et animae crementa reputanda, non substantiva, sed provocativa.

- 10 38. 1. Quamquam autem et retro praestruxerimus, omnia naturalia animae ipsi substantiae inesse pertinentia ad sensum et intellectum ex ingenito animae censu, sed paulatim per aetatis spatia procedere et varie per accidentia evadere pro artibus, pro institutis, pro locis, pro dominatricibus potestatibus, quod tamen faciat ad carnis ani-
 15 maeque propositam nunc societatem, pubertatem quoque animalem f. 150 cum carnali dicimus / convenire pariterque et illam suggestu sensuum et istam processu membrorum exsurgere a quarto decimo fere anno, non quia Asclepiades inde sapientiam supputat, nec quia iura civilia abhinc agendis rebus attemperant, sed quoniam et haec a primordio
 20 ratio est. 2. Si enim Adam et Eva ex agnitione boni et mali pudenda tegere senserunt, ex quo id ipsum sentimus, agnitionem boni et mali profiteamur. Ab his autem annis et suffusior et vestitior sexus est, et concupiscentia oculis arbitris utitur et communicat placitum et intellegit quae sint et fines suos ad instar ficulneae contagionis pru-
 25 rigine accingit et hominem de paradiso integritatis educit, exinde scabida etiam in ceteras culpas et delinquendi non naturales, cum iam non ex instituto naturae, sed ex vitio. 3. Ceterum proprie naturalis concupiscentia unica est alimentorum solummodo, quam deus et in

28. Gen. 2, 16.

2. dilationem B certi, non per adiectionem] certe non ad periectionem A 3. non, dum Aug. gen. ad litt. 10, 25, 40; Gel] nondum A B non * dum Wissowa ap. Rfd putans per incrementum vel tale quid intercidisse; refutat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,74 5. et splendor] exsplendor A exsplendor Rig₁ in Observ., Rig₂ in textu provehitur] alii perhibetur; vitiose Iun 6. nullius Bmg et om. A 8. agit Pam auget Iun 9. provectiva Iun
 10. DE CIBIS QUOMODO AD ANIMAM PERTINEANT (PERTINERE VIDEANTUR B Gel) A B Gel quamquam A B Gel
 11. subsubstantiae A sensum ex sum A corr. 12. ex Rfd] et A et ex B Gel 13. varie A accidentie A corr. 19. quoniam Rig] qm A quod B Gel a A] de B Gel 20. evva A 21. ex quo id] et quoad A 24. sint et] sint * et Rfd putans instrumentum vel similem vocem intercidisse; damnat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,75 fines] sinus Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,75 ficulneae contagionis] ficulneae * contagionis Rfd secundum quem zonae vel tale quid intercidit; sed cf. Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,74/5; Kroym. 114; Hoppe Beitr. 44; H. Koch, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 105 (1933), 50 purigine A B (prurigine Bmg) pubere vel tale quid susp. Kellner 349, 26. et . . . naturales om. Rig₁ delinquenti Iun naturales, cum] naturales * cum Rfd qui existimat rationes vel vias vel modos vel similem vocem intercidisse; refutat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,75 27. institutio A corr. 28. et om. B Gel

primordio contulit: ex omni ligno, inquit, edetis, et secundae post diluvium geniturae supermensus est: ecce dedi vobis omnia in escam tamquam olera faeni, prospectam non tam animae quam carni, etsi propter animam. Auferenda est enim argumentatoris occasio, qui quod anima desiderare videatur 5 alimenta, hinc quoque mortalem eam intellegi cupit, quae cibis sustineatur, denique derogatis eis evigescat, postremo subtractis intercidat. 4. Porro non solum proponendum est quisnam ea desideret, sed et cui; et si propter se, sed et cur et quando et quonam usque; tum quod aliud natura desideret, aliud necessitate, aliud secundum 10 proprietatem, aliud in causam. Desiderabit igitur cibos anima sibi quidem ex causa necessitatis, carni vero ex natura proprietatis. Certe enim domus animae caro est, et inquilinus carnis anima. / f. 150^v
5. Desiderabit itaque inquilinus ex causa et necessitate huius nominis profutura domui toto inquilinatus sui tempore, non ut ipse substruendus 15 nec ut ipse loricandus nec ut ipse tibicinandus, sed tantummodo continendus, quia non aliter contineri possit quam domo fulta. 6. Alioquin licebit animae dilapsa domo ex destitutione priorum subsidiorum incolumi abire, habenti sua firmamenta et propriae condicionis alimenta, immortalitatem rationalitatem sensualitatem 20 intellectualitatem arbitrii libertatem.

39. 1. Quae omnia nativitas animae conlata idem, qui in primordio invidit, nunc quoque obumbrat atque depravat, quominus aut ultro prospiciantur aut qua oportet administrentur. Cui enim hominum non adhaerebit spiritus nequam ab ipsa etiam ianua nativitatis 25 animas aucupabundus, vel qua invitatus tota illa puerperii superstitione? 2. Ita omnes idololatria obstetrice nascuntur, dum ipsi adhuc uteri infulus apud idola confectis redimiti genimina sua daemoniorum candidata profitentur, dum in partu Lucinae et Dianae eiulatur, dum per totam hebdomadam Iunoni mensa proponitur, 30 dum ultima die Fata Scribunda advocantur, dum prima etiam constitutio infantis super terram Statinae deae sacrum est. 3. Quis non

2. Gen. 9. 3.

3. olēra *A* holera *B Gel* prospectam *A B*] prospectum *Gel*
prospectans *Urs*; inter prospectam et prospecta dubitat *Th. St. T. 2,33/4*
5. argumentatoris *A* 6. cybis *A* 10. natura desideret]
est natura desiderare *Bmg* natura desiderare *Kellner 349*,
11. sibi] si *A corr. in mg.* 14. Desiderabit] siderabit *A (p. f. i.)*
15. inquilinatus *A* 16. loricandus *Lat*] gloriandus *A B Gel* solidandus vel
glutinandus *susp. Lindn* 18. priorum *A Bmg*] propriorum *B Gel*
24. ante Cui: NULLAM FERRE (PENE *Gel*) ANIMAM SINE DAEMONIO
(DE — *A*) ESSE *A B Gel* 25. nequam, qua *susp. Rfd et M. Ihm, Thes.*
l. L. II: 1237, 93/6 ianua] innua *A corr.* 26. animae *Iun susp.*
vel] ultro *Rfd susp.* qua] quia *Hartel ap. Rfd* 27. ipsa *A B*
28. uteri] viri *La Cerda susp.* 30. heulatur *A* eiulantur *Bmg*
hebdomadam *B Gel* 31. diē *A* fata scribundo *Iun dubitanter*
32. Statinae deae] statim aedeae (*Ae — B*) *A B* statim Aedeae vel Idaeae
(= Rheae, terrae) vel Adoneae (*Aug. civ. Dei 4,21*) vel Stativae *Renatus*
ap. La Cerda Statilinae deae mavult *R. Agahd, Jahrb. class. Philol. Suppl.*
24 (1898), 171

exinde aut totum filii caput reatui vovet aut aliquem excipit crinem
aut totum novacula prosecat aut sacrificio obligat aut sacro obsignat,
pro gentica, pro avita, pro publica aut privata devotione? Sic igitur
f. 151 5 genii deputantur, quod daemonum nomen est. / Adeo nulla ferme
nativitas munda est, utique ethnicorum. 4. Hinc enim et apostolus
ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis
praerogativa quam ex institutionis disciplina. Ceterum, inquit,
immundi nascerentur, quasi designatos tamen sanctitatis
10 ac per hoc etiam salutis intellegi volens fidelium filios, ut huius spei
pignore matrimoniis, quae retinenda censuerat, patrocineretur.
Alioquin meminerat dominicae definitionis: nisi quis nasce-
tur ex aqua et spiritu, non inibit in regnum
dei, id est, non erit sanctus.

15 40. 1. Ita omnis anima eo usque in Adam censetur, donec in
Christo recenseatur, tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur; peccatrix
autem, quia immunda, recipiens ignominiam et carnis ex societate.
2. Nam etsi caro peccatrix, secundum quam incedere prohibemur,
cuius opera damnantur concupiscentis adversus spiritum, ob quam
20 carnales notantur, non tamen suo nomine caro infamis. Neque enim
de proprio sapit quid aut sentit ad suadendam vel imperandam
peccatellam. Quidni? quae ministerium est, et ministerium non quale
servus vel minor amicus, animalia nomina, sed quale calix vel quid
aliud eiusmodi corpus, non anima. Nam et calix ministerium sitientis
25 est; nisi tamen qui sitit calicem sibi accommodarit, nihil calix mini-
strabit. 3. Adeo nulla proprietas hominis in choico, nec ita caro
homo tamquam alia vis animae et alia persona, sed res est alterius
plane substantiae et alterius condicionis, addicta tamen animae ut

8. 1 Cor. 7,14.

12. Joh. 3, 5.

15. Rom. 5, 14. 21.

1. filii] feli *A B* reatui] ea tui *A Bmg* aliquid excipit; Crimen *A*
2. totum *Iun*] tota *A B Gel* 3. publica *A corr.* 6. apostolus]
lus deest in *A* (p. f. i.) 8. praerogativa] procreativa *A Bmg*
9. sanctitati *Urs*; cf. *Lfst. Spr. T. 10* 10. ac] hac *A* saluti *Urs*
infidelium *Kroy. 114* 11. pignora *B Gel* patrocinerentur *Gel*
12. nascatur *B Gel* 13. introibit *B Gel* ibit *Rig* 15. QUOMODO CARO
PECCATRIX DICATUR *A B Gel* 16. quamdiu recenseatur] quamdiu
ethnica (vel non Christiana) susp. *Kroy. 115* quamdiu in mundo *Fr. Leo*
ap. *Kroy. 115*; approbat *Gomperz 2 et 75* 17. recipiens ignominiam et
carnis ex societate *Lindn*] recipiens ignominiam ex carnis ex societate *A*
recipiens ignominiam suam ex carnis societate *B Gel* respuens ignominiam
suam et in carnem et societatem *Bmg* recipiens ignominiam ex carnis societate
Rig respuens ignominiam suam et in carnem ex societate *Oehl Kroy. 115*
nec recipiens ignominiam ex carnis societate *Rfd* nec capiens ignominiam
ex carnis. Ex societate enim, etsi *Gomperz 75* 20. notantur infamia
B Gel (infamia *uncinis inclusit B*) 22. Quidni?] quid enim, *Iun*
23. animalia nomina *A*; approbat *Th. St. T. 2,35*] animalia nomine *B* animalis
nomine *Gel* animati et homines *Oehl* animati homines *Lindn* 25. est
om. *A* tamen om. *A* 26. Adeo] ideo *Rfd susp.* choicho *A*
28. plane substantiae et alterius om. *A* plane] conditionis. Plane *B*

suppellex, ut instrumentum in officia vitae. Caro igitur increpatur in scripturis, quia nihil anima sine carne in operatione libidinis gulae vinulentiae saevitiae idololatriae ceterisque carnalibus non sensibus, sed effectibus. 4. Denique sensus delictorum etiam sine effectibus / f. 151^v
imputari solent animae. Qui viderit ad concupiscen- 5
tiam, iam adulteravit in corde. Ceterum quid caro sine anima perinde in operatione probitatis iustitiae tolerantiae pudicitiae? Porro quale est, ut cui nec bona documenta propria subscribas, ei crimina adpingas? Sed ea per quam delinquitur convenitur, ut illa a qua delinquitur oneretur, etiam in ministerii accu- 10
sationem. Gravior invidia est in praesidem, cum officia pulsantur; plus caeditur qui iubet, quando nec qui obsequitur excusatur.

41. 1. Malum igitur animae, praeter quod ex obventu spiritus nequam superstruitur, ex originis vitio antecedit, naturale quodam- 15
modo. Nam, ut diximus, naturae corruptio alia natura est, habens suum deum et patrem, ipsum scilicet corruptionis auctorem, ut tamen insit et bonum animae, illud principale, illud divinum atque germanum et proprie naturale. 2. Quod enim a deo est, non tam extinguitur quam obumbratur. Potest enim obumbrari, quia non est deus, extingui non potest, quia a deo est. Itaque sicut lumen aliquo 20
obstaculo impeditum manet, sed non comparet, si tanta densitas obstaculi fuerit, ita et bonum in anima a malo oppressum pro qualitate eius aut in totum vacat occulta salute aut qua datur radiat inventa libertate. 3. Sic pessimi et optimi quidam, et nihilominus unum omnes animae genus; sic et in pessimis aliquid boni et in optimis 25
nonnihil pessimi. Solus enim deus sine peccato et solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et deus Christus. Sic et divinitas animae in praesagia erumpit ex bono priore et conscientia dei in testimonium prodit: 'deus bonus' et 'deus videt' et 'deo commendo'. Propterea nulla anima sine crimine, quia nulla sine boni semine. / 4. Proinde 30 f. 152
cum ad fidem pervenit reformata per secundam nativitatem ex aqua et superna virtute, detracto corruptionis pristinae aulaeo totam lucem suam conspicit. Excipitur etiam a spiritu sancto, sicut in pristina nativitate a spiritu profano. Sequitur animam nubentem spiritui caro,

5. Mth. 5, 28.

-
1. supellex *B Iun* officina *Pam* increpaturis *A corr.* 2. gullae *B*
3. vinolentiae *B Gel* idolatriae *A* 5. viderit mulierem *Pam*; contra
quem *Iun* et *Kroym.* 115 'qui viderit ad concupiscendum alii' *Seml*
7. interrogationis signum post anima ponit *Iun* 9. adpingas] appugnas *A*
10. virgulam post oneretur delet *Iun* in om. *A* accusatione *Iun*
11. praesidem *A* 13. DE MALO ET BONO ANIMAE *A B Gel*
16. deum] dominum *Rfd* 17. alterum illud] illum *A corr.* 18. propriae *A*
19. non est deus om. *A* 20. aliquod *A* 22. ita] via. ita *A B* obvia,
ita *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,76 23. occulta salute *A B Gel*] occultata
luce *Rig* occulta(ta) sua luce *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,76 28. presagia ex pres-
sagia *A* priore] proprio *Bmg*; cf. adn. crit. ad p. 55,18 29. bonus' et]
bonus est *B Gel* bonus *Rig* 32. virtute, et detracto *Iun* 33. a om. *A*;
cf. *Hoppe Beitr.* 20, 34. profanos sequitur *Iun*

ut dotale mancipium, et iam non animae famula, sed spiritus. O beatum conubium, si non admiserit adulterium!

42. 1. De morte iam superest, ut illic materia ponat, ubi ipsa anima consummat. Quamquam Epicurus vulgari satis opinione negarit mortem ad nos pertinere. Quod enim dissolvitur, inquit, sensu caret; quod sensu caret, nihil ad nos. Dissolvitur autem et caret sensu non ipsa mors, sed homo qui eam patitur. At ille ei dedit passionem, cuius est actio. Quodsi hominis est pati mortem dissolutricem corporis et peremptricem sensus, quam ineptum, ut tanta vis ad hominem non pertinere dicatur!
2. Multo coactius Seneca post mortem, ait, omnia finiuntur, etiam ipsa. Hoc si ita est, iam et mors ad semetipsam pertinebit, si et ipsa finitur; eo magis ad hominem, in quo inter omnia finiendo et ipsa finitur. Mors nihil ad nos, ergo et vita nihil ad nos.
3. Si enim quo dissolvimur praeter nos, etiam quo compingimur extra nos. Si ademptio sensus nihil ad nos, nec adeptio sensus quicquam ad nos. 3. Sed mortem quoque interimat qui et animam; a nobis ut de postuma vita et de alia provincia animae, ita de morte tractabitur, ad quam vel ipsi pertinemus, si ad nos illa non pertinet. Denique nec speculum eius somnus aliena materia est.

- f. 152^v 43. 1. De somno / prius disputemus, post, mortem qualiter anima decurrat. Non utique extranaturale est somnus, ut quibusdam philosophis placet, cum ex his eum deputant causis quae praeter naturam haberi videntur. 2. Stoici somnum resolutionem sensualis vigoris affirmant, Epicurei deminutionem spiritus animalis, Anaxagoras cum Xenophane defetiscentiam, Empedocles et Parmenides refrigerationem, Strato segregationem consati spiritus, Democritus indigentiam spiritus, Aristoteles marcorem circumcordialis caloris. Ego me nunquam ita dormisse praesumo, ut ex his aliquid agnoscam. Neque enim credendum

5. Epic. sent. II, p. 71 Usen. 11. cf. comm.

1. ut] et *A* etiam non *om. A* famulae *A* 3. DE MORTE *A B Gel*
 materiam *Oehl* ponatur *Rfd*; cf. *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,76; *Lfst. Spr. Tert.* 22
 4. consummat *Rfd*; cf. *Lfst. Spr. Tert.* 22 quamquam *A* 6. quod]
 et quod *B Gel* 8. Quodsi] quid si *A* 9. corporis et peremptricem *bis*
exhibent A B 12. seipsam *Iun* 13. pertinebit, si, et ipsa finitur: *Iun*
distinguit sic et *A* inter] interim *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,76 omnibus *A*
 14. post prius nos interrogationis signum ponit *Iun* 15. prius quo]
 quod *A B* dissolvitur *Iun* hoc modo distinguens: si enim quo dissolvitur,
 praeter nos; etiam quo compingimur, extra nos alterum quo] quod *A corr.*
 17. Sed] si et *Iun* quia *B Gel* a] in *Gel* 18. de postuma vita et
Rig] depositum a vita et *A B* depositum habitat et ut *Gel* ita] ista
Vir Doctus ad oram exemplaris mei' Oehl 19. non pertinet *om. A*
 denique nec *om. A* 21. DE SOMNO. Prius *A B* DE SOMNO PERTI-
 NENTE AD TRACTATUM MORTIS. De somno prius *Gel* disputem *A*
 23. preter *A* 24. sensualis vigoris] animalis vaporis *Siebeck Gesch. d.*
Psychol. 2,276; sed cf. *L. Stein, D. Psychol. d. Stoa* 1,141, ann. 271
 25. Epicurei *A* diminutionem *B Gel* cum cum *A* 27. Strato
 segregationem *om. A* con sati *A* indigentiam spiritus *om. A*
 28. numquam *A*

est defetiscentiam esse somnum, contrarium potius defetiscentiae, quam scilicet tollit, siquidem homo somno magis reficitur quam fatigatur. Porro nec semper ex fatigatione concipitur somnus, et tamen cum ex illa est, illa iam non est. 3. Sed nec refrigerescentiam admittam aut marcorem aliquem caloris, cum adeo corpora somno 5 concalescant et dispensatio ciborum per somnum non facile procederet calore properabili et rigore tardabili, si somno refrigeraremur. Plus est, quod etiam sudor digestionis aestuantis est index. Denique concoquere dicimur, quod caloris, non frigoris operatio est. 4. Perinde deminutionem animalis spiritus aut indigentiam spiritus aut segrega- 10 tionem consati spiritus immortalitas animae non sinit credi. Perit anima, si minoratur. 5. Superest, si forte, cum Stoicis resolutionem sensus vigoris somnum determinemus, quia corporis solius quietem procurat, non et animae. Animam enim ut semper mobilem et semper exercitam nunquam succidere quieti, alienae scilicet a statu immor- 15 talitatis; nihil enim immortale finem operis sui admittit, somnus f. 153 autem finis est operis. Denique corpori, cui mortalitas competit, ei soli quies finem operis adlatur. / 6. Qui ergo de somni naturalitate dubitabit, habet quidem dialecticos in dubium deducentes totam naturalium et extranaturalium discretionem, ut et quae putaverit 20 citra naturam esse naturae vindicari sciat posse, a qua ita esse sortita sunt, ut citra eam haberi videantur, et utique aut natura omnia aut nulla natura; apud nos autem id poterit audiri quod dei contemplatio suggerit, auctoris omnium de quibus quaeritur. 7. Credimus enim, si quid est natura, rationale aliquod opus dei esse. Porro somnum 25 ratio praeit, tam aptum, tam utilem, tam necessarium, ut absque illo nulla anima sufficiat, recreatorem corporum, redintegratorem virium, probatorem valetudinum, pacatorem operum, medicum laborum, cui legitime fruendo dies cedit, nox legem facit, auferens rerum etiam colorem. Quodsi vitale salutare auxiliare somnus, nihil 30 eiusmodi non rationale, nihil non naturale, quod rationale. 8. Sic et medici omne contrarium vitali salutari auxiliari extra naturales cardines relegant. Nam et aemulas somno valetudines, phreneticam atque cardiacam, praeter naturam iudicando naturalem somnum

2. siquidem] si quid *A* 4. nec] non *Rig*, refrigerescentiam *A* 5. coloris *A* 6. et *Gel*] ut *A B* 7. properabilis *Gomperz* 75 et rigore tardabili *om. A* tardabilis *Gomperz* 75 8. quod *om. A*
9. concoquere dicimur] con quoque recedimur *A* (con *sup. vers.*)
proinde *B Gel* 10. diminutionem *A* 11. con sati *A*
immortalis anima *B Gel* 12. superest] supest est *A* ut cum *Rfd susp.*
15. numquam *A* succidere *Lat.*; approbat *Hoppe Gnom. 11 (1935), 253]*
succedere *A B Gel* 18. adlatur *B Gel*; vindicavi *Mnemos. III 3 (1936), 170]* adlatur *A* adlatura *Mercerus* 20. et extranaturalium *om. A*
alterum et *om. A* 22. sunt] est *A B* 28. probatorem] prolatorem vel
prorogatorem *Lat*; quod damnat *Iun* pacatorem] peractorem *Hartel ap. Rfd*; qui *Patr. Stud. 4, 77* hanc coniecturam repudiat 31. nihil non naturale, quod rationale *scripsi om. A Gel* [nihil non naturale rationale quod rationale] *B*, al. desunt *Bmg* nihil non naturale *Pam* nihil non naturale, quia naturale, quod rationale *Kroym. 115; inter lectionem libri B* et nihil rationale non naturale, quod rationale dubitat *Th. St. T. 1, 77/8* 32. naturales *A B]* naturae *Bmg Gel* 34. atque cardiacam *om. A* indicando *B*

praeiudicaverunt; etiam in lethargo non naturalem notantes testimonio naturali respondent, cum in suo temperamento est. Omnis enim natura aut defraudatione aut enormitate rescinditur, proprietate mensurae conservatur. Ita naturale erit statu, quod non naturale
 5 effici potest decessu vel excessu. 9. Quid, si et esum et potum de naturae sortibus eximas? Nam et in his plurima somni praeparatura est. Certe his a primordio naturae suae homo inbutus est. Si apud deum discas, ille fons generis, Adam, ante ebibit soporem quam sitiit
 f. 153^v quietem, ante dormiit quam laboravit, immo quam et edit, / immo
 10 quam et profatus est, ut videant naturalem indicem somnum omnibus naturalibus principaliorum. 10. Inde deducimur etiam imaginem mortis iam tunc eum recensere. Si enim Adam de Christo figuram dabat, somnus Aadae mors erat Christi dormituri in mortem, ut de iniuria perinde lateris eius vera mater viventium figuraretur ecclesia.
 15 Ideo et somnus tam salutaris, tam rationalis etiam in publicae et communis iam mortis effingitur exemplar. 11. Voluit enim deus, et alias nihil sine exemplaribus in sua dispositione molitus, paradigmate Platonico plenius humani vel maxime initii ac finis lineas cotidie agere nobiscum, manum porrigens fidei facilius adiuvandae per
 20 imagines et parabolas sicut sermonum, ita et rerum. Proponit igitur tibi corpus amica vi soporis elisum, blanda quietis necessitate prostratum, immobile situ, quale ante vitam iacuit et quale post vitam iacebit, ut testationem plasticae et sepulturae, expectans animam quasi nondum conlatam et quasi iam ereptam. 12. Sed et illa sic
 25 patitur, ut alibi agere videatur, dissimulatione praesentiae futuram absentiam ediscens (de Hermitimo sciemus), et tamen interim somniat: unde tunc somnia? Nec quiescit nec ignavescit omnino nec naturam immortalitatis servam soporis addicit. Probat se mobilem semper;

8. Gen. 2, 21 seqq. 12. 1 Cor. 15, 45 14. Ioh. 19, 34.

1. testimonio naturali respondent] somnum naturalem spondent *Rfd susp.* somnum, naturalem respondent *Kroym. 115; lectionem traditam vindicant Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,77; Th. St. T. 2, 34/6* 2. cum in] cum sine *Hartel ap. Rfd; idem vel cum in iis sine Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,77; quem refutat Th. St. T. 2, 34/6* 5. prius et om. *Gel* 6. et in his] et his vel etiam his *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,78; refutat Th. St. T. 2,37* somni] homini *Hartel ap. Rfd susp.* paratura *Pam; contra disputat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,78* 7. imbutus *B Gel* 9. dormit *B* 10. videamus *Rfd susp.* videas *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,78 susp.* indicem somnum] indigentiam somni *Rfd susp.* indici somnum *Hartel ap. Rfd qui Patr. Stud. 4,78 inter hanc coniecturam (pro indici etiam indicere (sc. deum) proponens) et lectionem traditam dubitat; sed cf. Th. St. T. 2,37* 12. censere *Rfd susp.* figuram dabat] figurabat *Bmg Gel* 13. mortem] vitam *Seybold Zeitschr. neutest. Wiss. 12,351* 14. iniuria perinde lateris] vulnere percussi lateris vel ianua (sive ostio) aperti lateris *Seybold l. c.* 15. salutare *A corr.* 18. quotidie *A* 21. prostratum *A* 23. sculpturae *A* spectans *A; cf. Hoppe Beitr. 107,* 24. et] aut *Hartel ap. Rfd* erectam *B* (ereptam *Bmg*) 26. absentiae. Edisce *A* de Hermitimo sciemus om. *Gel* 27. unde tunc somnia? om. *Gel* tunc] sunt *B* 28. servam soporis *Gel*] serii soporis *A B* servam sopori (vel soporis) *Iun* feriis soporis *Oehl* servitio soporis *Hartel ap. Rfd* servituti (vel servam) soporis *Th. St. T. 3,22*

terra mari peregrinatur negotiatur agitur laborat ludit dolet gaudet, licita atque illicita persequitur, ostendit quod sine corpore etiam plurimum possit, quod et suis instructa sit membris, sed nihilominus necessitatem habeat rursus corporis agitando. Ita cum evigilaverit corpus, redditum officiis eius resurrectionem mortuorum / tibi affirmat. Haec erit somni et ratio naturalis et natura rationalis. Etiam per imaginem mortis fidem initiaris, spem meditaris, discis mori et vivere, discis vigilare, dum dormis. 5 f. 154

44. 1. Ceterum de Hermotimo. Anima, ut aiunt, in somno carebat, quasi per occasionem vacaturi hominis proficiscente de corpore. 10 Uxor hoc prodidit. Inimici dormientem nacti pro defuncto cremaverunt. Regressa anima tardius, credo, homicidium sibi imputavit. Cives Clazomenii Hermotimum templo consolantur. Mulier non adit ob notam uxoris. 2. Quorsum istud? Ne, quia facile est vulgo existimare secessionem animae esse somnum, hoc quoque Hermotimi 15 argumento credulitas subornetur. Genus fuerat gravioris aliquanto soporis, ut de incubone praesumptio est vel de ea valetudinis labe quam Soranus opponit excludens incubonem, aut tale quid vitii quod etiam Epimeniden in fabulam impegit quinquaginta paene annos somniculosum. Sed et Neronem Suetonius et Thrasymeden 20 Theopompus negant unquam somniasse, nisi vix Neronem in ultimo exitu post pavores suos. 3. Quid, si et Hermotimus ita fuit, ut otium animae nihil operantis in somnis divortium crederetur? Omnia magis coniectes quam istam licentiam animae sine morte fugitivae, et quidem ex forma continuam. Si enim tale quid semel accidere dicatur, 25 ut deliquium solis aut lunae, ita et animae, sane persuaderet divinitus factum; congruere enim hominem seu moneri seu terri a deo, velut fulgure rapido, momentaneae mortis ietu — si non magis / in proximo f. 154^v esset somnium credi, quod vigilantibus potius accidere deberet, si non somnium magis credi oporteret. 30

1. peregrinantur *A corr.* negotiatur agitur *om. A* aginatur *Iun (coll. adv. Hermog. 41 = 170,21 Kr.)* 6. At haec *A* rationalis]-lis *vix legibile est in A* 9. DE HERMOTIMO *A B DE HERMOTIMI ANIMA Gel* 10. vagaturi *Gel* hominis *Gel*; defendit *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,79* nominis *A B luminis Gel. sec. Oehl. (unde?)* somnis *Hartel ap. Rfd* vacaturi muneris vel vacaturae nomine *Gomperz 76* 12. virgulam ante tardius ponunt *Pam Iun* 13. clazomeni *A* Hermotimum *Bmg*] Hermippum *A B templum A* consolatur *A corr. m. rec.* 14. quorsum *A* Ne quia *A*] ut ne quia *B* ut quia non *Gel* utne quia *Rfd*; cf. *Hoppe Beitr. 132* 15. successionem *Seml* somnum *Pam*] somnium *A B Gel* 16. post subornetur interrogationis signum ponit *Rfd* 17. de ea *om. A* labe *om. A* 19. Epimenidem *B Gel* quinquaginta] sexaginta *Iun susp.* „sed auctoritatem MSS desidero” 20. scutonium *A* Thrasymeden scripsi] tharis medem *A* Thasimedem *B* Thrasimedem *Gel* Thrasymedem *Oehl* 21. negantum/quam *A* 23. animae . . . divortium *om. A* crederetur?] crederet, ut *Lat* 25. continuac *Lat*; quem refutat *Iun* continua *Rfd susp.*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,79* 26. solis *A* soli *Iun* persuadere *A* 27. congrueret *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,79* terri a deo, velut *Lat*] terri; adeo vult ut *A* terri, adeo velut *B Gel* 28. fulgore *Lat* virgulam post fulgure, non post rapido ponit *Iun* 29. si . . . oporteret *om. Rig* si non] nisi non *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,79*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Th. St. T. 1,79*

45. 1. Tenemur hic de somniis quoque Christianam sententiam expromere, ut de accidentibus somni et non modicis iactationibus animae, quam ediximus negotiosam et exercitam semper ex perpetuitate motationis, quod divinitatis et immortalitatis est ratio. Igitur
 5 cum quies corporibus evenit, quorum solacium proprium est, vacans illa a solacio alieno non quiescit et, si caret opera membrorum corporalium, suis utitur. 2. Concipe gladiatorem sine armis vel aurigam sine curriculis, gesticulantes omnem habitum artis suae atque conatum: pugnatur, certatur, sed vacua iactatio est. Nihilominus tamen fieri
 10 videntur quae fieri tamen non videntur; actu enim fiunt, effectu vero non fiunt. 3. Hanc vim ecstasin dicimus, excessum sensus et amentiae instar. Sic et in primordio somnus cum ecstasi dedicatus: et misit deus ecstasin in Adam et dormiit. Somnus enim corpori provenit in quietem, ecstasis animae accessit
 15 adversus quietem, et inde iam forma somnum ecstasi miscens et natura de forma. 4. Denique et oblectamur et contristamur et conterremur in somniis, quam affecte et anxie, passibiliter, cum in nullo permoveremur, a vacuis scilicet imaginibus, si compotes somniaremus. Denique et bona facta gratuita sunt in somnis et delicta secura;
 20 non magis enim ob stupri visionem damnabimur quam ob martyrii coronabimur. 5. Et quomodo, inquis, memor est somniorum anima, scilicet quam compotem esse non licet? Hoc erit proprietas amentiae
 f. 155 huius, quia non fit ex corruptela bonae / valetudinis, sed ex ratione naturae; nec enim exterminat, sed avocat mentem. Aliud est concutere,
 25 aliud movere, aliud evertere, aliud agitare. 6. Igitur quod memoria suppetit, sanitas mentis est; quod sanitas mentis salva memoria stupet, amentiae genus est. Ideoque non dicimur furere, sed somniare; ideo et prudentes, si quando, sumus. Sapere enim nostrum licet obumbretur, non tamen extinguatur, nisi quod et ipsum potest videri
 30 vacare tunc, ecstasin autem hoc quoque operari de suo proprio, ut sic nobis sapientiae imagines inferat, quemadmodum et erroris.

46. 1. Ecce rursus urgemur etiam de ipsorum somniorum retractatu quibus anima iactatur exprimere. Et quando pervenimus ad mortem?

13. Gen. 2,21

1. DE SOMNIIS AB DE SOMNIIS QUOMODO EA PATIATUR ANIMA ET UNDE EVENIANT *Gel* 2. somni et non *Rig* somnii et non *A B* [al. sed' *Bmg* somni, sed non *Gel* somnis et *Rfd susp.* 3. ex] et *B* 5. proprium *om. A* 7. conspice *Pam. 1597* 8. artis suae atque conatum *om. A* 9. iactio *A* 10. tamen *del. Iun* affectu *Gel* 11. extasin *A B Gel* [legendum ubique ecstasin more Graeco; aut (si quis malit) extasin' *Iun* 13. obdormivit *B Gel* 17. et passibiliter *B Gel* 18. compotes *A* (sed 22 compotem) 19. prius et] ei *B* 20. obtupri *A* 22. ametiae *A* 26. memoria stupet] memoria indicatur, si memoria stupet *Rfd susp.*, in textu lacunam signans; quem refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,80* 27. ideoque *A*] ideo *B Gel* dicimus *A corr.* 30. ecstasi *Hartel ap. Rfd*; qui *Patr. Stud. 4,81* lectionem traditam vindicat 32. etiam] et iam *B* sententiam *Rfd*; quem refutat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,81* retractatu] veritate aut eventu *Rfd susp.*; sed cf. *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,81* 33. expromere *Oehl susp. (coll. lin. 2)*

Et hic dixerim: cum deus dederit; nullae longae morae eius quod eveniet. 2. Vana in totum somnia Epicurus iudicavit liberans a negotiis divinitatem et dissolvens ordinem rerum et in passivitate omnia spargens, ut eventui exposita et fortuita. Porro si ita est, ergo erit aliquis et veritatis eventus, quia non capit solam eam eventui omnibus debito eximi. Homerus duas portas divisit somniis, corneam veritatis, fallaciae eburneam; respicere est enim, inquiunt, per cornu, ebur autem caecum est. 3. Aristoteles maiorem partem mendacio reputans agnoscit et verum. Telmessenses nulla somnia evacuant, imbecillitatem coniectationis incusant. Quis autem tam extraneus humanitatis, ut non aliquam aliquando visionem fidelem senserit? Pauca de insignioribus perstringens Epicuro pudorem imperabo. 4. Astryages Medorum regnator quod filiae Mandanae adhuc virginis vesicam in diluvionem Asiae fluxisse somnio viderit, Herodotus refert; item anno post nuptias eius / ex isdem locis vitem exortam toti Asiae incubasse. Hoc etiam Charon Lampsacenus Herodoto prior tradit. Qui filium eius tanto operi interpretati sunt, non fefellerunt, siquidem Asiam Cyrus et mersit et pressit. 5. Philippus Macedo nondum pater Olympiadis uxoris naturam obsignasse viderat anulo: leo erat signum; crediderat praeclusam genituram, opinor, quia leo semel pater est. Aristodemus vel Aristophon coniectans immo nihil vacuum obsignari, filium, et quidem maximi impetus, portendi. Alexandrum qui sciunt, leonem anuli recognoscunt. Ephorus scribit. 6. Sed et Dionysii Siciliae tyrannidem Himeraea quaedam somniavit. Heraclides prodidit. Et Seleuco regnum Asiae Laodice mater nondum eum enixa praevidit. Euphorion promulgavit. Mithridaten quoque ex somnio Ponti potitum a Strabone cognosco, et Baraliren Illyricum a Molossis usque Macedoniam ex somnio dominatum de Callisthene disco. 7. Noverunt et Romani veritatis huiusmodi somnia. Reformatorem imperii, puerulum adhuc et privatum loci, et Julium Octavianum tantum et sibi ignotum Marcus Tullius iam et Augustum et

4. ut] et *A* 7. eburnam *A* perspicere *Rfd*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Hoppe Beitr. 104* 8. autem *om. A* maiorem *Rfd susp.*; *Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312*] maiore *A B Gel* maiori *Oehl* partem *Rfd susp.*; *Blf l. c.*] *om. A* sententiam *B Gel* mendatio *A* mendaciorum *Rfd susp.* 9. reputans *Blf l. c.*] recitans *A Gel* ei recitans *B citans Rfd susp.* veram *Rig vera Rfd susp.* Telmissenses *Iun mavult* 15. hisdem *B Geleiusdem Iun* iisdem *Rig* 17. tanti operis *Bmg lacunam post tanto operi signat Rfd putans fore parem vel simile quid intercidisse* interpretati *A* 18. pressit *A* 19. obsignatam esse *Rfd* obsignasse se (vel obsignasse) *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,82*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Lfst. Spr. T. 52* viderat] visus erat *Scal* 20. genituram. Opinor... est, Aristodemus *Iun distinguit* 21. mater *La Cerdia susp. post est lacunam signat Rfd putans adversatus est vel tale quid intercidisse coniectant vel <de maiore cautione interpretantur, sed Aristander>* coniectans *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,82* coniectant *Blf. Mus. 41 (1934), 312* 24. dionisius *A* siciliae ex siliciae *A* hemere. aquaedam *A Hemerea B*, Himeram legit *Valerius Bmg Himerea Gel* 25. Seleucho *B* 26. prænixa *A* provulgavit *B Gel* mithridaten *A* Mithridatem *B Gel* Mithradatem *Iun* quoquo *A* 27. baralirem *A* Balaridem *B Gel* illyricum mallosis *A* 28. Callisthene disco. Noverunt] gallis tenendis cognoverunt *A* 29. huiusmodis omnia *A corr.* 30. alterum et *om. A* Octavianum *Rfd susp.* 31. Marcus Tullius et Catulus *La Cerdia susp.*

civilium turbinum sepulcrem de somnio norat. In Vitelliis commen-
tariis conditum est. 8. Nec haec sola species erit summarum prae-
dicatrix potestatum, sed et periculorum et exitiorum: ut cum Caesar
in praelio perduellium Bruti et Cassii Philippi aeger alias, maius
5 tamen discrimen ab hostibus relaturum de Artorii visione destituto
tabernaculo evadit; ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit
de solis unguine et lavacro Jovis. 9. Revelantur et honores / et ingenia
f. 156 per quietem, praestantur et medellae, produntur et furta, conferuntur
et thesauri. Ciceronis denique dignitatem parvuli etiamnunc gerula
10 iam sua inspexerat. Cynus de sinu Socratis demulcens homines
discipulus Plato est. Leonymus pycetes ab Achille curatur in somniis.
Coronam auream cum ex arce Athenae perdidissent, Sophocles tragicus
somnia redinvenit. Neoptolemus tragoedus apud Rhoeteum Troiae
sepulcrum Aiace monitus in somniis ab ipso ruina liberat, et cum
15 lapidum senia deponit, dives inde auro reddit. 10. Quanti autem
commentatores et affirmatores in hanc rem? Artemon Antiphon
Strato Philochorus Epicharmus Serapion Cratippus Dionysius Rhodius
Hermippus, tota saeculi litteratura. Solum, si forte, ridebo qui se
existimavit persuasurum, quod prior omnibus Saturnus somniarit,
20 nisi si et prior omnibus vixit. Aristoteles, ignosce ridenti. 11. Ceterum
Epicharmus etiam summum apicem inter divinationes somniis extulit
cum Philochoro Atheniensi. Nam et oraculis hoc genus stipatus est
orbis, ut Amphiaraei apud Oropum, Amphilochoi apud Mallum, Sar-
pedonis in Troade, Trophonii in Boeotia, Mopsi in Cilicia, Hermionae
25 in Macedonia, Pasiphaeae in Laconica. Cetera cum suis et originibus
et ritibus et relatoribus, cum omni deinceps historia somniorum,
Hermippus Berytensis quinione voluminum satiatissime exhibebit.
Sed et Stoici deum malunt providentissimum humanae institutioni
inter cetera praesidia divinatorum artium et disciplinarum somnia

1. norant *Gel La Cerda* Vitelliis *A B Gel*; *vindicavi Mnemos. III 3*
(1936), 170/1] Vitellii *Urs* vitae illius *Ger. Vossius* 4. praelium *A B Gel*
cassii *A* philippus *A B* alias, maius tamen discrimen ab hostibus
relaturum de *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,82/3*] alias maius tamen alias crimen ab
hostibus relaturum se *A B* alias maiestatem, alias crimen (discrimen *Pam*)
ab hostibus relaturus *Gel Pam* maius tamen alias discrimen *Rig* alias,
maius tamen ratus discrimen ab hostibus relaturum se *Oehl* alias maius
ominatus discrimen ab hostibus relaturum se *Lindn* alias, maius tamen
discrimen ab hostibus relaturus, de *Hartel ap. Rfd* 5. artori *A B*
7. solis unguine] soli sanguine *A* 8. medellae *B Gel* 10. suam *Gel*
11. Cleonymus *Gel* somnis *Rig* 12. prodidissent *B* tragicus *A*
13. Rhoeteum *Iun*] ritreum *A* Erithreum *B Gel* Rheteum *Pam* Rhoeteum
Oehl Roeteum *Rfd* Troiae et *Rfd* 14. sepulcrum *A B Gel* ipsa *B Gel*
liberatur *B Gel* 15. disponit *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,83* 16. et affirmatores
om. A arthemion *A* 17. diony * sius ex dioni * sius *A* et Dionysius
B Gel rhodius *A* 20. vixit. Aristoteles, ignosce ridenti *A B Gel*; *approbat*
Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,83] vixit Aristoteles, ignosce ridenti *Seml* vixit Aristoteles.
Ignosce ridenti *Iun* 21. somnia *susp. A. O. F. Lorenz, Leb. u. Schr. des . . .*
Epicharmos (Berol. 1864), 299 23. apud Oropum, Amphilochoi] apudor
optumam, philoci *A* apud Horopum, Amphilochoi *B Gel* 24. Trophoni *A*
boeotia *A* calicia *A* Sicilia *Rig_{1/2}* Hermione *Pam* Hermoniae *Rig₃*
25. phasiphe *A* Pasiphaeae *B Gel* 26. relationibus *Seml*
27. Berithensis *B* Beritensis *Gel* Beriensis *Urs* 29. somnia] omnia *Leopold*

quoque magis indidisse, peculiare solacium naturalis oraculi. 12. Haec quantum ad fidem somniorum / a nobis quoque consignandam et f. 156^v aliter interpretandam. Nam de oraculis etiam ceteris, apud quae nemo dormitat, quid aliud pronuntiabimus quam daemonicam esse rationem eorum spirituum qui iam tunc in ipsis hominibus habitaverint 5 vel memorias eorum affectaverint ad omnem malitiae suae scenam, in ista aequae specie divinitatem mentientes eademque industria etiam per beneficia fallentes medicinarum et admonitionum, praenuntiationum, quo magis laedant iuvando, dum per ea quae iuvant ab inquisitione verae divinitatis abducunt ex insinuatione falsae? 10

13. Et utique non clausa vis est nec sacrariorum circumscribitur terminis; vaga et pervolatrica et interim libera est. Quo nemo dubitaverit domus quoque daemoniis patere nec tantum in adytis, sed in cubiculis homines imaginibus circumveniri.

47. 1. Definimus enim a daemoniis plurimum incuti somnia, etsi interdum vera et gratiosa, sed, de qua industria diximus, affectantia atque captantia, quanto magis vana et frustratoria et turbida et ludibriosa et immunda. Nec mirum, si eorum sunt imagines quorum et res. 2. A deo autem, pollicet scilicet et gratiam spiritus sancti in omnem carnem et sicut prophetaturos, ita et somniaturos servos suos et ancillas suas, ea deputabuntur quae ipsi gratiae comparabuntur, si qua honesta sancta prophetica revelatoria aedificatoria vocatoria, quorum liberalitas soleat et in profanos destillare, imbres etiam et soles suos peraequante deo iustis et iniustis, siquidem et Nabuchodonosor divinitus somniat et maior paene vis hominum ex visionibus deum discunt. Sicut ergo dignatio dei et in ethnicos, ita et temptatio mali et in sanctos, a quibus nec interdiu absistit, ut vel dormientibus obrepit qua potest, si vigilantibus non potest. / 3. Tertia species erunt somnia quae sibimet ipsa anima videtur inducere ex intentione circumstantiarum. Porro quam non est ex arbitrio somniare (nam et Epicharmus ita sentit), quomodo ipsa erit sibi causa alicuius visionis? Num ergo haec species naturali formae relinquenda est

19. Ioel 2, 28/9. 23. Mtth. 5, 45. 24. Dan. 2, 1 seq.

1. magis *A Bmg*; *approbant Kroy. 116* (qui hanc vocem dat. plur. subst. g. e. magus putat) et *Th. St. T. 2,38*] nobis *B Gel* 2. et taliter *Rig* etsi aliter *Kroy. 116* 3. interpretandum *A B Lindn* qui hoc modo distinguit: . Et aliter interpretandum. 4. pronuntiabimus *A* daemonicam *Rig2-3* 6. vel ad *B Gel* scaenam *A* 7. spetie *A* 8. beneficia] veneficia *Renatus' La Cerd* admonitionum, *A*] admonitionum et *B Gel* praenuntiatione *A* 9. quo] quae *Gel* laedanti/iuvando *A* 10. insinuationem *A* 14. circumveniri v. d. *Vliet 92*; *approbat Blf Mus. 41* (1934), 312] circumvenire *A B Gel* 16. de del. *Iun* de... diximus notis *parentheses* includit *Kroy. 116* 17. post captantia punctum ponit *Kroy. 116* tertium et del. *Rig* 18. post immunda interrogationis signum ponit *Kroy. 116* 19. *A del. Rfd*; quem refutat *Kroy. 116 Lfst. Spr. T. 93* et inductum in *A* 22. vocatoria om. *A* 26. et in om. *A* 27. et om. *B Gel*; cf. v. d. *Vliet 91*, *Th. St. T. 2,82* nec interdiu nec noctu v. d. *Vliet 91/2* qui in hac sententia lacunam signat absistit *A* 30. quam] qua *Urs* quoniam *Lat* quum *Seml* quia *Rfd*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Kroy. 116* 31. *picharmus A* 32. forma *A*

servans animae etiam in ecstasi res suas perpeti? 4. Ea autem, quae neque a deo neque a daemonio neque ab anima videbuntur accidere, et praeter opinionem et praeter interpretationem et praeter enarrationem facultatis, ipsi proprie ecstasi et rationi eius separabuntur.

- 5 48. 1. Certiora et colatiora somniari affirmant sub extimis noctibus, quasi iam emergente animarum vigore producto sopore. Ex temporibus autem anni verno magis quieta, quod aestas dissolvat animas et hiems quodammodo obduret et autumnus, temptator alias valetudinum, succis pomorum vinosissimis diluat. 2. Item ex ipsius quietis
10 situ, si neque resupina neque dextero latere decumbat neque conresupinatis internis, quasi refusus oculis, statio sensuum fluitet aut compressa iecoris sagina † sit mentis. Sed haec ingeniose aestimari potius quam constanter probari putem, etsi Plato est qui ea aestimavit; et fortassean casu procedant. Alioquin ex arbitrio erunt somnia, si
15 dirigi poterunt. 3. Nam quod et de cibis distinguendis vel derogandis nunc praesumptio nunc superstitio disciplinam somniis praescribit, examinandum est: superstitio, ut cum apud oracula incubaturis ieiunium indicitur, ut castimoniam inducat, praesumptio, ut cum Pythagorici ob hanc quoque speciem fabam respuunt onerosum et
f. 157^v 20 inflatui pabulum. Atquin trina illa cum Daniele fraternitas / legumine solo contenti, ne regis ferculis contaminarentur, praeter sapientiam reliquam somniorum praecipue gratiam a deo redemerunt et impetrandorum et disserendorum. 4. Ieiunus autem nescio an ego solus plurimum ita somniem, ut me somniasse non sentiam. Nihil ergo
25 sobrietas, inquis, ad hanc partem? Immo tanto magis ad hanc, quantum et ad omnem; si et ad superstitionem, multo amplius ad religionem. Sic enim et daemonia expostulant eam a suis somniatoribus ad lenocinium scilicet divinitatis, quia familiarem dei norunt, quia et Daniel rursus trium hebdomadam statione aruit victu, sed ut deum
30 inliceret humiliationis officiis, non ut animae somniaturae sensum et

20. Dan. 2, 16 seqq. 29. Dan. 10, 1 seqq.

1. servanti *Kroym.* 116 ea] et *A* corr. 2. anima *A* corr.
occidere *Gel* 3. interpretationem *A* narrationem *A* 4. facultati
ipsi propriae *Kroym.* 116 proprię *A* 5. collatiora *A* corr.; *B*
6. producto *Seml* 7. autem *om.* *A* quieta, quod *Urs]* qui &
aquod *A* quieta est quod *B Gel* aestas *Iun]* *om.* *A B Gel* dissolvat
aestas *Iun* animas *del. Iun* 8. hiemps *A Rfd* hyems *B Gel* 9. sucus
A succus *B* sucis *Oehl* po † morum *A* vinosissimus *B* viriosissimis
Iun susp. 10. alterum neque] neque/neque *A* 11. repulsis *A Bmg*
localis *A B* fluit et *A B* compressu *Gel* 12. sagina *A Bmg]*
angina *B Gel* 14. fortasse an *A B Gel* 15. derogandis] decorandis *A*
decurandis *Rig* 17. examinanda est superstitio *B Gel* incubaristuris
A corr. 18. ut] *om.* *A* vel *Rfd* castimoniam] *om.* *A* castimonia *Rfd*
inducat] *om.* *A* inducit *B* inducitur *Rfd* 19. et inflatui] et inflatum
Gel ex inflatu *Rfd susp.* 21. regis *B Gel* 22. a *sup. vers.* *A*
imperandorum *A* 23. ieiunus *A*; *susp. Iun A non inspecto]* ieiuniis *B Gel*
25. interrogationis signum post partem primus posuit *Iun* 29. daniel *A*
aruit] caruit *Mercerus Rfd*; *damnant Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,83/4;
Lfst. Spr. T. 77

sapientiam strueret, quasi non in ecstasi acturae. Ita non ad ecstasin summovendam sobrietas proficiet, sed ad ipsam ecstasin commendandam, ut in deo fiat.

49. 1. Infantes qui non putant somnare, cum omnia animae pro modo aetatis expungantur in vita, animadvertant succussus et nutus et reidentias eorum per quietem, ut ex re comprehendant motus animae somniantis facile per carnis teneritatem erumpere in superficiem. 2. Sed et quod Libyca gens Atlantes caeco somno transigere dicuntur, animae utique natura taxantur. Porro aut Herodoto fama mentita est nonnunquam in barbaros calumniosa aut magna vis eiusmodi daemonum in illo climate dominatur. Si enim et Aristoteles heroem quendam Sardiniae notat incubatores fani sui visionibus privantem, erit et hoc in daemonum libidinibus, tam auferre somnia quam inferre, ut Neronis quoque seri somniatoris et Thrasymedis insigne inde processerit. / 3. Sed et a deo deducimus somnia. Quid ergo nec a deo Atlantes somniarent, vel quia nulla iam gens dei extranea est, in omnem terram et in terminos orbis evangelio coruscante? Num ergo aut fama mentita est Aristoteli aut daemonum adhuc ratio est, dum ne animae aliqua natura credatur immunis somniorum?

50. 1. Satis de speculo mortis, id est de somno, cum etiam de negotiis somni, id est de somniis; nunc ad originem huius excessus, id est ad ordinem mortis, quia nec ipsam sine quaestionibus, licet finem omnium quaestionum. 2. Publica totius generis humani sententia mortem naturae debitum pronuntiamus. Hoc stipulata est dei vox, hoc sponndit omne quod nascitur, ut iam hinc non Epicuri

17. Rom. 10, 18.

1. in] *om.* *A* aliter vel alias in *Rfd susp.* sine *Hartel ap. Rfd, Patr. Stud. 4,84* lectionem traditam vindicans 2. commodandam *Rfd susp.*; quod damnat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,84* 4. omni *A*
8. atlantico *A* Athlantico *B* Atlantica *susp. Th. St. T. 2,40* transigere *A*; vindicant *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,84 Kroym. 117*] non transigere *B* (al. deest non' *Bmg*) noctem transigere *Gel*; *Th. St. T. 2,40* dubitat utrum noctem omittendum sit necne 9. taxantur *A B Kroym. 117*] taxatur *Gel Th. St. T. 2,40* non taxatur *Rfd*; dubitat *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,84/5* 11. et *om. A*
12. heroën *B* 13. auferes omnia *A* 14. Thrasymedis *Iun*] tharsi medis *A* Thrasimedis *B Gel* 15. Sed . . . 18. Num secludit *Kroym. 118* somnia] omnia *A B* (al. somnia' *Bmg*) quid ergo? . . . somniarent? *Iun*
16. Athlantes *B* 18. Num] nunc *Kellner 362*, unum *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud. 4,86*; lectionem traditam defendit *Hoppe Gnom. 11 (1935), 253* Aristoteli] delet *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,86* Herodoto *Kroym. 118*; inter utriusque coniecturam dubitat *Th. St. T. 2,41* 19. adhuc] ad hoc *Rfd Kroym. 118* animae *om. B Gel* 20. interrogationis signum delent *Iun Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,85/6 Kroym. 118* 21. DE MORTIS VI (VI *om. A*) ET DE MENANDRO HAERETICO (HE — *A*) *A B Gel* cum *A B Gel*] tum *Iun Urs* 23. ad *om. Gel* ordinem mortis] originem mortis *B* (al. ordinem' *Bmg*) mortem *Kroym. 118* ipsa *Rfd*; quod damnat *Kroym. 118*
24. finis *Rfd*; quod damnat *Kroym. 118*

stupor suffundatur negantis debitum istud ad nos pertinere, sed haeretici magi Menandri Samaritani furor conspuatur dicentis mortem ad suos non modo non pertinere, verum nec pervenire: in hoc scilicet se a superna et arcana potestate legatum, ut immortales et incorruptibiles et statim resurrectionis compotes fiant, qui baptismus eius induerint. 3. Legimus quidem pleraque aquarum genera miranda, sed aut ebriosos reddit Lyncestarum vena vinosa aut lymphaticos efficit Colophonis scaturigo daemonica aut Alexandrum occidit Nonacris Arcadiae venenata. Fuit et Iudaeae lacus medicus ante Christum. Plane Stygias paludes poeta tradidit mortem diluentes, sed et Thetis filium planxit. Quamquam si et Menander in Stygem f. 158^v mergit, moriendum erit / nihilominus, ut ad Stygem venias; apud inferos enim dicitur. 4. Quenam et ubinam ista felicitas aquarum, quas nec Iohannes baptizator praeministravit nec Christus ipse discipulis demonstravit? Quod hoc Menandri balneum? Comicum credo. Sed cur tam infrequens, tam occultum, quo paucissimi lavant? Suspectam enim faciam tantam raritatem securissimi atque tutissimi sacramenti, apud quod nec pro deo ipso mori lex est, cum contra omnes iam nationes ascendant in montem domini et in aedem dei 20 Jacob mortem per martyrium quoque flagitantis, quam de Christo etiam suo exegit. Nec magiae tantum dabit quisquam, ut eximat mortem aut repastinet vitis modo vitam aetate renovata. Hoc enim ne Medae quidem licuit in hominem, etsi licuit in vervecem. 5. Translatus est Enoch et Helias nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet. 25 Ceterum morituri reservantur, ut antichristum sanguine suo extinguant. Obiit et Iohannes, quem in adventum domini remansurum frustra fuerat spes. Fere enim haereses ad nostra exempla prosiunt inde sumentes praesidia quo pugnant. Postremo compendium est: ubi sunt illi quos Menander ipse perfudit, quos in Stygem suam mersit? 30 Apostoli perennes veniant, adsistant; videat illos meus Thomas, audiat contrectet et credidit.

51. 1. Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis ani-

19. Gen. 28, 12. 23. Gen. 5, 24 (Hebr. 11, 5). 4 Reg. 2, 11. 25. Apoc. 11, 3.
26. Ioh. 21, 23. 30. Ioh. 20, 24/9.

1. suffundatur tantum *Gomperz* 77 sed et *Gomperz* 77 2. magi] magis *Urs* 7. sed aut] sicut aut *Lindn* dubitanter scilicet ut *Oehl* aut] ut *Oehl* 8. scatur rigo *A* aut] ut *Oehl* Alexandrum occidit *scripsi*] Alexandro accidit *A B Gel* ut Alexandrum, occidit *Iun* 9. iudaeae *A* ante Christum] amne Christi *Bmg* 10. deluentes *Iun* post diluentes *virgulam posui* 11. quanquam *A* stygen (*etiam l. 12*) *B* 12. nihilominus] *ni- via legibile est in A* 13. inferor *A corr.* 15. post balneum *interrogationis signum primus posuit Iun* comicum] magicum *Urs* 16. cur] quur *B* quo paucissimi lavant] quod paucis simulabant *Bmg* 20. de Christo] dextro *A* 23. nemediæ *A* Nemediae *B* in hominem, etsi licuit *om. A* alterum licuit] quidem *Rig.* verbecem *A B* 28. pugnent *Iun susp.* 29. mersit, apostoli perennes? *Iun distinguit* 30. assistant *ex ac sistant A* 51. credat *Fam* crediderit *Rfd*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Lfst. Spr. T. 91/2* 32. NIHIL ANIMAE IN CORPORE SUBREMANERE *A B Gel* POST MORTEM *Gel addit*

maeque. Sed quidam ad immortalitatem animae, quam quidem non a deo edocti infirme tuentur, ita argumentationes emendicant, ut velint credi etiam post mortem quasdam animas adhaerere corporibus. 2. Ad hoc enim et Plato, etsi quas vult animas ad caelum statim expedit, in Politia tamen cuiusdam / insepulti cadaver opponit longo 5 f. 159 tempore sine ulla labe prae animae scilicet individuitate servatum. Ad hoc et Democritus crementa unguium et comarum in sepulturis aliquanti temporis denotat. Porro et aeris qualitas corpori illi potuit tutela fuisse. 3. Quid enim, si aridior aer et solum salsius? Quid, si et ipsius corporis substantia exsuccior? Quid, si et genus mortis 10 ante iam corruptelae materias erogarat? Ungues autem cum exodia nervorum sint, merito nervis resolutione porrectis provectiones et cotidie deficiente carne expelli videntur. Comae quoque alimenta de cerebro, quod aliquamdiu durare praestat secreta munitio. Denique in viventibus etiam pro cerebri ubertate vel affluit capillago vel 15 deserit. Habes medicos. 4. Sed nec modicum quid animae subsidere in corpore est decessurum quandoque et ipsum, cum totam corporis scenam tempus aboleverit. Et hoc enim in opinione quorundam est; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aiunt parentes superfluo animae. Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquiis animae adulatrix, 20 sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aversatrix, quod et ipsum homo non utique mereatur poenali exitu impendi. 5. Ceterum anima indivisibilis, ut immortalis, etiam mortem indivisibilem exigit credi, non quasi immortalis, sed quasi indivisibili animae indivisibiliter accidentem. Dividetur autem et mors, si et anima, superfluo scilicet 25 animae quandoque morituro; ita portio mortis cum animae portione remanebit. 6. Nec ignoro aliquod esse vestigium opinionis istius. De meo didici. Scio feminam quandam vernaculam ecclesiae, forma et aetate integra functam, post unicum et breve matrimonium cum in pace dormisset et morante adhuc / sepultura interim oratione 30 f. 159^v presbyteri componeretur, ad primum halitum orationis manus a lateribus dimotas in habitum supplicem conformasse rursumque condita pace situi suo reddidisse. 7. Est et illa relatio apud nostros, in coemeterio corpus corpori iuxta collocando spatium accessui com-

1. quidam] quidem *Urs* animae tuendam *Kroym.* 119
quidem *Iun]* quidam *A B Gel* 2. a deo] adeo *A Iun* 4. celum *A*
5. politiam *A* 9. enim *om. B Gel* 10. exsuction *A*
exsuccior *Oehl* 11. corruptelae *Bmg; vindicat Kroym.* 119] corruptele *A*
corruptrices *B Gel* erogat *A Bmg* exodia *Iun]* exordia *AB Gel* 12. et]
sed *Bex Rfd susp.* 13. quotidie *A Gel* 14. praestat *A* 15. crebris *A*
affluit *A affluit B* 16. medicos. Sed] medicos, si *Gel* 17. virgulam post
est *primus posuit Iun* 18. scaenam *A* 22. homo] id est homo vel scilicet
homo *Rfd susp.* humo *Hartel ap. Rfd (approbat Gomperz 71) qui Patr.*
Stud. 4,86 lectionem traditam vindicat 23. invisibilis *A Bmg*
invisibilem *A Bmg* 24. invisibili *A B* invisibiliter *A B (indi-Bmg)*
25. prius et *om. A* 26. morituro *Iun]* moriturae *A B Gel* 28. vernacula
Harnack ap. Rfd 30. sepultura] se-deest in *A (p.f.i.)* 31. habitum
B Gel aditum *Urs* 33. condicta *Iun* illa] alia *Gel* 34. corpori
fratris *Rfd susp.* collocando *A* accessui *Hartel ap. Rfd]* accessu *A B;*
vindicat Hartel Patr. Stud. 3,82 recessu *Gel*

municasse. Si et apud ethnicos tale quid traditur, ubique deus potestatis
suae signa proponit, suis in solacium, extraneis in testimonium.
Magis enim credam in testimonium ex deo factum quam ex ullis
animae reliquiis, quae si inessent, alia quoque membra movissent,
et si manus tantum, sed non in causam orationis. Corpus etiam illud
5 non modo fratri cessisset, verum et alias mutatione situs sibimet
ipsi refrigerasset. 8. Certe undeunde sunt ista, signis potius et ostentis
deputanda, naturam facere non possunt. Mors, si non semel tota est,
non est; si quid animae remanserit, vita est; non magis vitae miscebitur
10 mors quam diei et nox.

52. 1. Hoc igitur opus mortis: separatio carnis atque animae;
seposita quaestione fatorum et fortuitorum bifariam distinxit humanus
affectus, in ordinariam et extraordinariam formam, ordinariam
quidem naturae deputans, placidae cuiusque mortis, extraordinariam
15 vero praeter naturam iudicans, violenti cuiusque finis. 2. Qui autem
primordia hominis novimus, audenter determinamus mortem non ex
natura secutam hominem, sed ex culpa, ne ipsa quidem naturali;
facile autem usurpari naturae nomen in ea quae videntur a nativitate
ex accidentia adhaesisse. Nam si homo in mortem directo institutus
f. 160 20 fuisset, tunc demum mors / naturae adscriberetur. Porro non in
mortem institutum eum probat ipsa lex condicionali comminatione
suspendens et arbitrio hominis addicens mortis eventum. Denique
si non deliquisset, nequaquam obisset. Ita non erit natura quod ex
oblationis potestate accidit per voluntatem, non ex instituti auctoritate
25 per necessitatem. 3. Proinde etsi varii exitus mortis, ut est multimoda
condicio causarum, nullum ita dicimus lenem, ut non vi agatur.
Ipsa illa ratio operatrix mortis, simplex licet, vis est. Quid enim?
quae tantam animae et carnis societatem, tantam a conceptu con-
cretionem sororum substantiarum divellit ac dirimit. Nam etsi prae
30 gaudio quis spiritum exhalet, ut Chilon Spartanus, dum victorem
Olympiae filium amplectitur, etsi prae gloria, ut Clidemus Atheniensis,
dum ob historici stili praestantiam auro coronatur, etsi per somnium,
ut Plato, etsi per risum, ut P. Crassus, multo violentior mors quae
per aliena grassatur, quae animam per commoda expellit, quae tunc
35 mori affert, cum iocundius vivere est in exultatione in honore in

1. aliquid *A* tradit *A* utique *B* *Gel* 3. in testi-
monium] *om.* *A* in *omittere mavult Iun* 7. undeunde *Scal. Mercerus]*
unde *A B Gel*; *rindicat Iun*; *dubitat Hoppe Beitr. 113,* 10. et
om. B Gel 11. separationem *Gel* 12. factorum *Rfd susp.*
17. culpam *A corr.* 19. „al. ex accidenti. sed et accidentia Tertulliani
est” *Iun* dir & to *A* 21. probat] — obat *deest in A (p. f. i.)*
23. obisset *B Gel* erat *Pam* 24. oblationis] exorbitationis
Rfd abolitionis Hartel ap. Rfd (Patr. Stud. 4, 87 hanc coniecturam delens)
26. diximus *A B* 27. Quid enim] quidni *Heraldus* 31. Clydemus *A B*
32. ob historici stili praestantiam *Oehl*] ab historicis diu praestantiam *A B*
ab histrionibus ob praestantiam *Gel* ob historiarum praestantiam *Rfd*
historicis ludis praestantium *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4, 88* 33. mors, quam
quae *v. d. Vliet 92; quod damnat Th. Eran. 7 (1907), 97* 35. iucundius *A*
vivere] vere *B*

reque in voluptate. 4. Vis est et illa navigiis, cum longe a Caphereis saxis, nullis depugnata turbinibus, nullis quassata decumanis, adulante flatu, labente cursu, laetante comitatu, intestino repente percussu cum tota securitate desidunt. Non secus naufragia sunt vitae etiam tranquillae mortis eventus. Nihilo refert integram abire corporis 5 navem an dissipatam, dum animae navigatio evertatur.

53. / 1. Sed quo deinde anima nuda et explosa devertit, sine dubio f. 160^v prosequemur ex ordine; prius tamen quod est loci huius explebimus, ne, quia varios exitus mortis ediximus, expectet quis a nobis rationes singulorum medicis potius relinquendas, propriis arbitris omnium letalium rerum sive causarum et ipsarum corporalium condicionum. 2. Plane ad immortalitatem animae hic quoque protegendam in mentione mortis aliquid de eiusmodi exitu interstruam, in quo paulatim ac minutatim anima dilabatur; habitum enim sustinens defectionis abducitur, dum absumi videtur, et coniecturam praestat interitus de excessus temperatura. Tota autem in corpore et ex corpore est ratio. Nam quisquis ille exitus mortis, sine dubio aut materiarum aut regionum aut viarum vitalium eversio est: materiarum, ut fellis, ut sanguinis; regionum, ut cordis, ut iecoris; viarum, ut venarum, ut arteriarum. 3. Dum igitur haec ex propria quaque iniuriarum causa vastantur in corpore ad usque ultimam eversionem et rescissionem vitalium, id est naturalium, finium situum officiorum, necessario et anima dilabentibus paulatim instrumentis et domiciliis et spatiis suis paulatim et ipsa migrare compulsa deducitur in deminutionis effigiem, non alio modo quam quo et aurigam ipsum quoque defecisse praesumitur, cum vires equorum defatigatio denegavit, quantum de dispositione destituti hominis, non de passionis veritate. Perinde auriga corporis, spiritus animalis, deficiens vectaculi nomine, non suo deficit, opere decedens, non vigore, actu elanguens, non statu, constantiam, non substantiam decoquens, quia comparere cessat, non quia esse. 4. Sic et rapida quaque mors, ut cervicum messis, semel

1. requiete *A* et illa] illa *Oehl* ut illa, *Hartel ap. Rfd et Patr. Stud.* 4,88 et inlata *Rfd*; lectionem traditam vindicat *Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 97/8 navigii *A* B navigia *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,88 Caphereis scripsi] chaperēi *A* Chaperēis *B* Caphareis *Gel* 2. nullis depugnata turbinibus *om. A* 3. cursu, laetante *om. A* (cursulae tantae) *B* 4. post desidunt virgulam ponit *Hartel Patr. Stud.* 4,88 naufragia *B* alii naufrangia *Iun* post vitae *edd. omnes virgulam exhibent quam delendam probavit Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 98 6. dum *B Gel*; vindicat *Th. Eran.* 7 (1907), 98] cum *A* 7. DE ANIMARUM EXCESSU *A B Gel* Sed quo deest in *A* (p. f. i.) quo deinde] quod inde *B* devertit scripsi] divertit *A* devertet *B Gel* divertet *Pam* interrogationis signum post devertet exhibent *Oehl Rfd*; *Iun* virgulam post devertet delet, post sine dubio ponit 10. propriis *A* arbitriis *B* laetatum *B* 12. mentionem *B* 13. eiusmodi *B Gel* in delet *Iun* quo . . . anima] quoque protegendam animam *A* 15. abducitur, dum] dum abducitur, *Kroym.* 119 17. aut regionum . . . materiarum *om. A* 20. quaeque *Rfd* 21. recessionem *Gel* 23. spaciis *A* 24. deminutionis *Iun*] diminutionis *A B Gel* 28. deficiens vectaculi *Th. St. T.* 1,56] deficiens vectaculis *A* deficientis vectaculi *B Gel* 29. languens *Gel* 30. comparare *B* (comparere *Bmg*)

- ac tantam ianuam pandens, ut ruinae vis semel omnia vitalia elidens,
 f. 161 ut apoplexis, / interior ruina, nullam animae moram praestat nec
 discessum eius in momenta discruciat, at ubi longa mors, prout
 deseritur anima, ita et deserit; non tamen conciditur hac facie, sed
 5 extrahitur, et dum extrahitur, postrematatem suam partem videri
 facit. Non omnis autem pars statim et abscisa est, quia postera est,
 nec quia exigua est, statim et ipsa peritura est. Sequitur seriem suus
 finis et mediocritas trahitur a summa et reliquiae universitati
 cohaerentes expectantur ab illa, non derelinquuntur. Atque ita ausim
 10 dicere, totius ultimum totum est, quia, licet minus atque posterius
 sit, ipsius est. 5. Hinc denique evenit saepe animam in ipso divortio
 potentius agitari sollicitiore obtutu, extraordinaria loquacitate, dum
 ex maiore suggestu iam in libero constituta per superfluum quod
 adhuc cunctatur in corpore enuntiat quae videt, quae audit, quae
 15 incipit nosse. Si enim corpus istud Platonica sententia carcer, ceterum
 apostolica dei templum, cum in Christo est, sed interim animam
 consepito suo obstruit et obscurat et concretione carnis infaecat, unde
 illi, velut per corneum specular, obsoletior lux rerum est. 6. Procul
 dubio cum vi mortis exprimitur de concretione carnis et ipsa expres-
 20 sione colatur, certe de oppanso corporis erumpit in apertum ad meram
 et puram et suam lucem, statim semetipsam in expeditione substantiae
 recognoscit et in divinitatem ipsa libertate respiscit, ut de somnio
 emergens ab imaginibus ad veritates. Tunc et enuntiat et videt,
 tunc exultat aut trepidat, prout paraturam devorsorii sui sentit, de
 25 ipsius statim angeli facie, evocatoris animarum, Mercurii poetarum.

54. 1. Quo igitur deducetur anima, iam hinc reddimus. Omnes
 f. 161^v ferme philosophi, / qui immortalitatem animae, qualiterqualiter volunt,
 tamen vindicant, ut Pythagoras, ut Empedocles, ut Plato, quique aliquod
 illi tempus indulgent ab excessu usque in conflagrationem universitatis,
 30 ut Stoici, suas solas, id est sapientium, animas in supernis mansionibus
 collocant. 2. Plato quidem non temere philosophorum animabus
 hoc praestat, sed eorum qui philosophiam scilicet exornaverint amore
 puerorum. Adeo etiam inter philosophos magnum habet privilegium

16. 1 Cor. 6, 19. 31. Plato Sympos. 203. Phaedr. 248 seq.

1. ac om. Pam tantam] totam Iun ut] aut Urs ruina A Rig, in
 Observ. vitalia om. Gel 3. prout Bmg] prouti A B 4. anima] mors Bmg
 conceditur A Bmg condicetur B facies A Bmg 5. partim
 Rfd susp. 6. abscissa B Gel 7. ipsa om. Gel 8. a] ad B Gel
 9. relinquuntur A atque ita, ausim dicere, totius Iun distinguit
 11. venit A; approbat Blf Mus. 41 (1934), 312; damnat Hoppe Beitr. 110
 evenit saepe, animam Iun distinguit 12. sollicitiore A corr. 13. per
 om. A 15. ceterum . . . Christo del. Kroym. 119 16. sed] et Kroym. 119
 17. et obscurat . . . est del. Kroym. 119 18. per om. A est
 procul dubio: cum Iun distinguit 19. expressione A 21. expeditione A
 22. ut de somno, ut de somnio A ut de somno B Gel 23. Tunc et] et del. Iun
 et videt] quae videt Gel 24. exaltat B diversorii Gel
 25. vocatoris A 26. DERCEPTU A B Gel Quo] quod A 27. fermae A
 qui im-deest in A (p. f. i.) qualiterqualiter Oehl Rfd] qualiter
 A B Gel 28. tamen] tantum B Gel pythagoras A 30. et stoici A
 sapientum B Gel

impuritas. Itaque apud illum in aetherem sublimantur animae sapientes, apud Arium in aerem, apud Stoicos sub lunam. 3. Quos quidem miror, quod imprudentes animas circa terram prosternant, cum illas a sapientibus multo superioribus erudiri affirment. Ubi erit scholae regio in tanta distantia deversoriorum? Qua ratione discipulae ad magistras conventabunt tanto discrimine absentes? Quis autem illis postumae eruditionis usus ac fructus iamiam conflagratione perituris? 4. Reliquas animas ad inferos deiciunt. Hos Plato velut gremium terrae describit in Phaedone, quo omnes labe mundialium sordium confluendo et ibi desidendo exhalant et quasi caeno immunditiarum suarum grossiorem haustum et privatum illic aerem stipent.

55. 1. Nobis inferi non nuda cavositas nec subdivalis aliqua mundi sentina creduntur, sed in fossa terrae et in alto vastitas et in ipsis visceribus eius abstrusa profunditas, siquidem Christo in corde terrae triduum mortis legimus expunctum, id est in recessu intimo et interno et in ipsa terra operto et intra ipsam clauso et inferioribus adhuc abyssis superstructo. 2. Quodsi Christus deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum scripturas et sepultus / secundum easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit forma humanae mortis apud inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora caelorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes sui faceret, habes et regionem inferum subterraneam credere et illos cubito pellere qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum, aspernati, si forte, in Abrahae sinu expectandae resurrectionis solacium capere. 3. Sed in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus. Ceterum quod discrimen ethnicorum et Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem? Quo ergo animam exhalabis in caelum Christo illic adhuc sedente ad dexteram patris, nondum dei iussu per tubam archangeli audito,

8. Plato Phaedo 112 seq. 14. Mtth. 12, 40. 16. Ps. 85, 13.
20. Eph. 4, 9. Ioh. 3, 13. 21. 1 Petr. 3, 19. 23. Mtth. 10, 24. 25. Luc. 16, 22.
29. 1 Thess. 4, 15/16.

1. & herem A 2. haerem A 4. illa A 5. scolae A
deversorium A 6. conventabunt B Gel; vindicat Hoppe Gnom.
11 (1935), 253] convertentur A Bmg 9. phedone A 10. ibi]
ibidem B alterum et om. A B 11. suarum om. A crassierem Gel
haustu susp. Krohn Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 2337,3 illic aerem] illicerem A
illic acre Rfd susp. 13. alto] alvo Iun susp. 14. Christum B Gel
15. terrae] trita A triduum... expunctum om. A 16. in ipsa
Gel] ex ipsa A B clauso A B] cavato Bmg Gel 17. ante Quodsi:
DE INFERIS ET AN ILLUC OMS A DE INFERIS ET AN ILLUC
OMNES ANIMAE COMPELLENTUR (-ANTUR Gel) B Gel 18. alterum
secundum] secus A huic] hic Gel 19. apud inferos] -d infe- deest in
A (p. f. i.) 22. regionem] originem Gel 23. quia Gel putant Rig
24. dño A 25. carpere B 28. Quomodo ergo Gel Quo ergo anima
modo Rig; lectionem traditam vindicat Kroym. 119 anima Gel
exhalabis Kroym. 119 qui hoc modo distinguit: Quo... exhalabis? In
caelum? Christo... patris, nondum... audito, nondum... invenerit,
obviam... resurgunt (l. -ent)?] exhalabit A B Gel sedente... patris
om. A 29. turbam A corr.

nondum illis quos domini adventus in saeculo invenerit, obviam ei ereptis in aerem, cum his qui mortui in Christo primi resurgent? Nulli patet caelum terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi reserabuntur regna caelorum. 4. Sed in aethere
 5 dormitio nostra cum puerariis Platonis aut in aere cum Ario aut circa lunam cum Endymionibus Stoicorum? Immo, inquis, in paradiso, quo iam tunc et patriarchae et prophetae appendices dominicae resurrectionis ab inferis migraverint. Et quomodo Iohanni in spiritu paradisi regio revelata, quae subicitur altari, nullas alias animas
 10 apud se praeter martyrum ostendit? Quomodo Perpetua, fortissima martyr, sub die passionis in revelatione paradisi solos illic martyras vidit, nisi quia nullis romphaea paradisi iantrix cedit nisi qui in Christo decesserint, non in Adam? 5. Nova mors pro deo et extra-
 f. 162^v ordinaria pro Christo alio et privato / excipitur hospitio. Agnosce
 15 itaque differentiam ethnici et fidelis in morte, si pro deo occumbas, ut paracletus monet, non in mollibus febribus et in lectulis, sed in martyriis, si crucem tuam tollas et sequaris dominum, ut ipse praecepit. Tota paradisi clavis tuus sanguis est. Habes etiam de paradiso a nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari
 20 in diem domini.

56. 1. Occurrit disceptatio, an hoc ab excessu statim fiat, an quasdam animas aliqua ratio detineat hic interim, an etiam receptas liceat postea ab inferis ex arbitrio vel ex imperio intervenire. 2. Nec harum enim opinionum suasoriae desunt. Creditum est insepultos non
 25 ad inferos redigi quam iusta perceperint, secundum Homericum Patroclum funus in somniis de Achille flagitantem, quod non alias adire portas inferum posset arcentibus eum longe animabus sepul-
 30 torum. Novimus autem praeter poeticae iura pietatis quoque Homericae industriam. Tanto magis enim curam sepulturae collocavit, quanto etiam moram eius iniuriosam animabus incusavit, simul et ne quis defunctum domi detinens ipse amplius cum illo maceretur enormitate solacii dolore nutriti. Ita querellas animae insepultae ad utrumque confinxit, ut instantia funeris et honor corporum servetur et memoria affectuum temperetur. 3. Ceterum quam vanum, ut anima corporis
 35 iusta sustineat, quasi aliquid ex illis ad inferos avehat? Multo vanius,

6. Mtth. 27, 52.

8. Apoc. 6, 9.

17. Mtth. 16, 24 (10, 38;

Marc. 8, 34; Luc. 14, 27).

2. raptis *Gel*

3. inclausa *Rfd susp.*

5. pueris *B Gel*

11. para-

dysi *A*

martyras *A*] contra martyres *B* commartyres *Gel*

12. vidit *A*] suos vidit *B Gel* (suos *uncinis inclusit B*)

romphea *A*

caedit *B Gel*

13. decesserint. Non . . . 14. hospitio *B Gel distinguunt;*

interrogationis signum post Adam primu posuit Urs

14. excipitur]

exci-deest in A (p. f. i.)

15. si]s-deest in *A (p. f. i.)*

morte. Si . . .

17. praecepit, tota *Rig distinguit*

16. paraclitus *A*

18. paradysi *A*

habet *A*

21. AN COMMORENTUR HIC ANIMAE POST MORTEM

VEL AB INFERIS COMMEENTUR *Gel*

24. suasoria *Gel*

insepultas *B*

non ante ad *Gel*

25. redici *A corr.*

26. somnis *Gel*

27. argentibus *A*

28. poetica *B Gel*

32. nutrito *Rfd*

quaerellas *A* querelas *B Gel*

33. memoria *A Bmg*] moeror *B Gel*

si iniuria deputabitur animae cessatio sepulturae, quam pro gratia deberet amplecti. Utique enim tardius ad inferos abstrahi malet, quae nec mori voluit. Amabit impium heredem, per quem adhuc pascitur luce. Aut si qua pro certo iniuria est tardius sub terram detrudi, titulus autem iniuriae / cessatio est sepulturae, perquam iniquum eam iniuria 5 f. 163 affici, cui non imputabitur cessatio sepulturae ad proximos scilicet pertinens. 4. Aiunt et immatura morte praeventas eo usque vagari istic, donec reliquatio compleatur aetatum, quacum pervixissent, si non intempestive obissent. Porro aut constituta sunt tempora unicuique, et constituta praeripi posse non credam, aut si constituta sunt 10 quidem, dei tamen voluntate vel aliqua potestate mutilantur, frustra mutilantur, si iam impleri sustinentur, aut si non sunt constituta, nulla erit reliquatio temporum non constitutorum. 5. Adhuc addam: ecce obiit verbi gratia infans sub uberum fontibus, puta nunc puer investis, puta vesticeps, qui tamen octoginta annos victurus fuisset. 15 Hos praereptos ut anima eius hic post mortem transigat, quale est? Aetatem enim non potest capere sine corpore, quia per corpora operantur aetates. Nostri autem illud quoque recogitent, corpora eadem recepturas in resurrectione animas in quibus discesserunt. 6. Idem ergo sperabuntur et corporum modi et eadem aetates, quae 20 corporum modos faciunt. Quo ergo pacto potest infantis anima hic transigere praerepta tempora, ut octogenaria resurgat in corpore mensis unius? Aut si hic necesse erit ea tempora impleri quae fuerant destinata, num et ordinem vitae, quem sortita sunt tempora pariter cum illis hic destinatum, pariter hic anima decurret, ut et studeat 25 ab infantia pueritiae delegata et militet ab adolescentia iuventae excitata et censeat a iuventa senectae ponderata, et fenus exprimat et agrum urgeat, naviget litiget nubat labore aegritudines obeat et quaecumque illam cum temporibus / manebant tristitia ac laeta? f. 163^v 7. Sed haec sine corpore quomodo transigentur? Vita sine vita? Sed 30 vacua erunt tempora solo decursu adimplenda. Quid ergo prohibet apud inferos ea impleri, ubi perinde nullus est usus illorum? Ita dicimus omnem animam quaque aetate decesserit, in ea stare ad

1. deputatur alii' *Iun* 2. malet *B*] *mallet A Gel* 3. per quam *Gel* 5. ea iniuriam *B* 6. non deest in *A* (p. f. i.)
 imputatur *Gel*; lectionem traditam vindicant *Kroy. 120 Hoppe Beitr. 37/8* 7. ante Aiunt: AN DEMORENTUR HIC ANIMAE POST MORTEM *A B* praeventos *Kroy. 120* eosque *A* eousque *B Gel* 8. isthic *B Gel* isti hic *Iun susp.* relinquo *A* aetatum *B*; vindicat *Kroy. 120*] aestatum *A* aetatis *Gel* quacum *A*] qua cum *B Gel* quas tum *Urs*; quod vindicat *Hoppe Gnom. 11 (1935), 253* quantum (vel quam tum *Lindn*) *Oehl Lindn* quam tum *Rfd* quascumque *Kroy. 120*
 9. obiissent *B Gel* 10. praecipi *Gel* non] ne *B* 11. potestate mutilantur] potestatum utilantur *A* potestatum mutilantur *Bmg*
 12. sustinentur *A B*] sustinent *Gel* 15. octoginta] *LXXX A*
 19. resurrectionem *A*; quod damnat *Hoppe Beitr. 29*, decesserunt *B Gel*
 20. iidem *Gel* moduli *B Gel* aedem *A* 21. modos]modo *B B*
 26. adolescentia *B Gel* iuventae *Rig.*] iuventa *A Gel* inventa *B*
 27. a del. *Lat* senecta *Lat* fenus *A* 29. manebant] manc-deest in *A* (p. f. i.) 30. prius Vita] vi-deest in *A* (p. f. i.) interrogacionis signum post alterum vita primus posuit *Iun* 32. implere *Rfd*

eum diem usque, quo perfectum illud repromittitur ad angelicae plenitudinis mensuram temperatum . 8. Proinde extorres inferum habebuntur quas vi ereptas arbitrantur, praecipue per atrocitates suppliciorum, crucis dico et securis et gladii et ferae; nec isti porro exitus
 5 violenti quos iustitia decernit, violentiae vindex. Et ideo, inquires, scelestae quaeque animae inferis exulant. Alterum ergo constituas, compello, aut bonos aut malos inferos: si malos placet, etiam praecipitari illuc animae pessimae debent; si bonos, cur idem animas immaturas et innuptas et pro condicione aetatis puras et innocuas
 10 interim indignas inferis iudicas?

57. 1. Aut optimum est hic retineri secundum ahoros aut pessimum secundum biaeoathanatos, ut ipsis iam vocabulis utar quibus auctrix opinionum istarum magia sonat, Ostanes et Typhon et Dardanus et Damigeron et Nectabis et Berenice. 2. Publica iam litteratura est
 15 quae animas etiam iusta aetate sopitas, etiam proba morte disiunctas, etiam prompta humatione dispunctas evocaturam se ab inferum incolatu pollicetur. Quid ergo dicemus magian? Quod omnes paene, fallaciam. Sed ratio fallaciae solos non fugit Christianos, qui spiritualia
 f. 164 nequitiae, non quidem socia conscientia, sed inimica scientia novimus, /
 20 nec invitatoria operatione, sed expugnatoria dominatione tractamus multiformem luem mentis humanae, totius erroris artificem, salutis pariter animaeque vastatorem; sic etiam magiae, secundae scilicet idololatriae, in qua se daemones perinde mortuos fingunt, quemadmodum in illa deos. Quidni? cum et dii mortui. 3. Itaque invocantur
 25 quidem ahori et biaeoathanati sub illo fidei argumento, quod credibile videatur eas potissimum animas ad vim et iniuriam facere quas per vim et iniuriam saevus et immaturus finis extorsit, quasi ad vicem offensae. 4. Sed daemones operantur sub ostentu earum, et hi vel maximè qui in ipsis tunc fuerunt, cum adviverent, quique illas in
 30 huiusmodi impegerant exitus. Nam et suggestimus nullum paene hominem carere daemonio, et pluribus notum est daemoniorum quoque opera et immaturas et atroces efficii mortes, quas incursibus deputant.

1. eam *A* usque, quo *Rfd*] usquequo *A B Gel* 2. perinde *Rfd*
 nec extorres *Urs* 3. praecipue per atrocitates *B Gel*] praecipua
 atrocitate *A Bmg* 6. quaequae *Rfd* exultant *A* 7. aut malos
 inferos] inferos aut malos *B Gel* si malos, placet: *B Gel* distinguunt
 et iam *Gel* 9. alterum et del. *Rig* 10. interim] inter *La Cérda*
virgulam post interim ponit Gel indignas *Iun*] dignas *A B Gel*
 non iudicas *Pam* 11. retineris *A* ahoros *Gel*] ahoros *A B* aoros
Bmg 12. biaeoathanato *A* 13. magica *B Gel* ostentantes *A B*
 Hostanes *Pam* 14. Damogeron *Iun* littera *A* litera *Bmg*
 15. sop * itas *A* 17. magiam *B Gel* paene] poenae *B* 18. fallaciae *A*
 20. * ope * ratione *A* tractamus] -actamus *deest in A (p. f. i.)*
 21. humanae totius, *Iun* distinguit salutis] alterum s *deest in A (p. f. i.)*
 22. vastatricem scientiam magiae *Urs* vastatorem, totius erroris artificem,
 sic etiam magiae *Gomperz 78* magiae] magiae obnitimur *Kroyrn. 120*
 scilicet et *B* 23. idolatriae *A corr. i. mg. m. alia eiusdem aelatis*
 per * i * nde *A* 24. Itaque], aeque *Oehl ita Kellner 373,* 25. hacori *A*
 achori *B* 27. et immaturus] etiam maturus *A B* ad invicem *A Bmg*
 28. Sed om. *B* obtentu *B Gel* 30. impegerunt *Urs; lect. trad.*
vindicat Lfst. Spr. T. 80 31. carere] capere *A* 32. quas] quasi *A*

5. Hanc quoque fallaciam spiritus nequam sub personis defunctorum delitescens, nisi fallor, etiam rebus probamus, cum in exorcismis interdum aliquem se ex parentibus hominis sui affirmat, interdum gladiatorem vel bestiarum, sicut et alibi deum, nihil magis curans quam hoc ipsum excludere quod praedicamus, ne facile credamus 5 animas universas ad inferos redigi, ut et iudicii et resurrectionis fidem turbent. Et tamen ille daemon, postquam circumstantes circumvenire temptavit, instantia divinae gratiae victus id quod in vero est invitus confitetur. 6. Sic et in illa alia specie magiae, quae iam quiescentes animas evellere ab inferis creditur et conspectui exhibere, non alia 10 fallaciae vis est: / operatior plane, quia et phantasma praestatur, quia f. 164^v et corpus affingitur; nec magnum illi exteriores oculos circumscribere, cui interiorum mentis aciem excaecare perfacile est. 7. Corpora denique videbantur Pharaoni et Aegyptiis magicarum virgarum dracones; sed Mosei veritas mendacium devorat. Multa utique et adversus apostolos 15 Simon et Elymas magi; sed plaga caecitatis de praestigiis non fuit. Quid novi aemulatio veritatis a spiritu immundo? Ecce hodie eiusdem Simonis haeretici tanta praesumptio se artis extollit, ut etiam prophetarum animas ab inferis movere se spondeant. 8. Et credo, quia mendacio possunt; nec enim pythonico tunc spiritui minus licuit 20 animam Samuelem effingere, post deum mortuos consulente Saule. Absit alioquin, ut animam cuiuslibet sancti, nedum prophetarum, a daemonio credamus extractam, edocti quod ipse satanas transfiguretur in angelum lucis, nedum in hominem lucis, etiam deum se asseveraturus in fine signaque portentosiora 25 editurus ad evertendos, si fieri possit, electos. Dubitavit, si forte, tunc prophetam se dei asseverare et utique Sauli, in quo iam ipse morabatur, 9. ne putes alium fuisse qui phantasma administrabat, alium qui commendabat, sed eundem spiritum et in pseudoprophetide et in apostata facile mentiri quod fecerat credi, 30 per quem Sauli thesaurus illic erat ubi et cor ipsius, ubi scilicet deus non erat. Et ideo per quem visurum se credidit vidit, quia per quem

13. Exod. 7, 12. 15. Act. ap. 8,9 *seqq.* 13, 8 *seqq.* 20. 1 Reg. 28,6 *seqq.*
23. 2 Cor. 11, 14. 25. 2 Thess. 2, 4. 26. Mtth. 24, 24. 31. Mtth. 6, 21.

1. sub personis] supersonis A 3. hominis *Mercerus*] hominem A B Gel
sui] suis Urs fuisse Iun 5. predicamus A 7. turbet Urs
9. spetie A 11. operatior] oper-deest in A (p. f. i.) operantior Oehl operatrix
vel tale quid susp. Kellner 374, post operatior distinguit Urs; sed cf. Hartel
Patr. Stud. 4,89 post plane distinguit B quia del. Iun praestat
Urs 12. magnum] imaginum B 15. Moysis Rig Mosis Seml devoravit
B Gel 16. Simon A] Simon dedit B Gel Simon edidit Scal Elimas
B Gel 17. immundorum A corr. hodie A 18. haeretici (hc — A)
A Bmg] haereticos B Gel heredes Gebhardt ap. Rfd se artis extollit
A; approbat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,89] artifex tollit B artis extollit Bmg Gel
20. mendatio A pythonico A corr. 22. prophete A
23. Sathanas B Gel 25. in fine A] insigne B om. Gel signaque] que
om. A portentosiora... evertendos om. A 26. aediturus Gel
28. virgulam post morabatur ponit Blf. Mus. 41 (1934), 312, interrogationis
signum Rig, punctum Oehl Rfd fantasma A 29. administravit A
eodem A Bmg 30. pseudopropheti A 31. Saulis B Gel
thensaurus A illicerat A

vidit et credidit. 10. Si et de nocturnis imaginibus opponitur saepe non frustra mortuos visos (nam et Nasamonas propria oracula apud parentum sepulchra mansitando captare, ut Heraclides scribit vel
 f. 165 Nymphodorus vel Herodotus, et Celtas apud virorum fortium busta /
 5 eadem de causa abnoctare, ut Nicander affirmat), non magis mortuos vere patimur in somnis quam vivos, sed eadem ratione mortuos quae et vivos et omnia quae videntur. Non enim quia videntur vera sunt, sed quia adimplentur. Fides somniorum de effectu, non de conspectu renuntiatur. 11. Nulli autem animae omnino inferos patere satis
 10 dominus in argumento illo pauperis requiescentis et divitis ingenuiscentis ex persona Abrahae sanxit, non posse inde relegari renuntiatorem dispositionis infernae, quod vel tunc licere potuisset, ut Moysi et prophetis crederetur. 12. Sed etsi quasdam revocavit in corpora dei virtus in documenta iuris sui, non idcirco communicabitur fidei
 15 et audaciae magorum et fallaciae somniorum et licentiae poetarum. Atquin in resurrectionis exemplis, cum dei virtus sive per prophetas sive per Christum sive per apostolos in corpora animas repraesentat, solida et contrectabili et satiata veritate praeiudicatum est hanc esse formam veritatis, ut omnem mortuorum exhibitionem incorporalem
 20 praestigias iudices.

58. 1. Omnis ergo anima penes inferos? inquis. Velis ac nolis, et supplicia iam illic et refrigeria: habes pauperem et divitem. Et quia distuli nescio quid ad hanc partem, iam oportune in clausula reddam. 2. Cur enim non putes animam et puniri et foveri in inferis interim
 25 sub expectatione utriusque iudicii in quadam usurpatione et candida eius? Quia salvum debet esse, inquis, in iudicio divino negotium suum sine ulla praelibatione sententiae; tum quia et carnis opperienda est
 f. 165^v restitutio / ut consortis operarum atque mercedum. 3. Quid ergo fiet in tempore isto? Dormiemus? At enim animae nec in viventibus
 30 dormiunt; corporum enim est somnus, quorum et ipsa mors cum speculo suo somno. Aut nihil vis agi illic, quo universa humanitas trahitur, quo spes omnis sequestratur? Delibari putas iudicium an incipi? Praecipitari an praeministrari? Iam vero quam iniquissimum

10. Luc. 16, 30/1. 22. Luc. 16, 19 *seqq.*

2. frustrari *Gel* visos *Urs*] vivos *A B Gel* Nasammonas
B Gel Nasamonas *Leopold* 3. sepulchra *B Gel* 4. nymphidorus
ex nympidorus A 5. mortuos] -os *deest in A (p. f. i.)*
 6. patitur *A Bmg* sed] si *A*; *vindicat Gomperz 78* 7. vivos et omnia
 quae videntur *A*; cf. *Gomperz 78*] vivos et omnia quae videntur vera sunt *B*
 vivos. at somnia quae videntur vera sunt *Gel* vivos. nec omnia, quae videntur
 vera sunt *Rfd* vivos] -s *deest in A (p. f. i.)* 10. illo *om. A*
 ingemescentis *A* 11. inde *om. Gel* renuntiatorem *A* 12. Mosis *Seml*
 13. et si *B* 17. representat *A* 21. AN PUNIANTUR APUD INFEROS
 ANIMAE *A B* AN ALIQUID INTERIM PATIANTUR APUD INFEROS
 ANIMAE *Gel* omnes ergo animae *B Gel* interrogationis signum post
 inferos *primus posuit Iun* inquit *A* 22. refrigeria habes, *Iun distinguit*
 23. oportune *A* opportune *B Gel* clausulam *B Gel* 25. quadam *A*
 26. in *del. Urs* 27. tum] *om. A* et tunc *B* operienda *B Gel*
 28. ut consortis] ut co- *deest in A (p. f. i.)*

otium apud inferos, si et nocentibus adhuc illic bene est et innocentibus nondum! Quid amplius vis esse post, mortem confusa spe et incerta expectatione ludentem an vitae recensum iam et ordinationem iudicii inhorrentem? 4. Semper autem expectat anima corpus, ut doleat aut gaudeat? Nonne et de suo sufficit sibi ad utrumque titulum passionis? 5 Quotiens inlaeso corpore anima sola torquetur bile ira taedio plerumque nec sibi noto? Quotiens item corpore afflicto furtivum sibi anima gaudium exquirat et a corporis tunc importuna societate secedit? 5. Mentior, si non de ipsis cruciatibus corporis et gloriari et gaudere sola consuevit. Respice ad Mutii animam, cum dexteram suam ignibus 10 solvit; respice ad Zenonis, cum illam Dionysii tormenta praetereunt. Morsus ferarum ornamenta sunt iuventutis, ut in Cyro ursi cicatrices. Adeo novit et apud inferos anima et gaudere et dolere sine carne, quia et in carne et inlaesa si velit dolet et laesa si velit gaudet. Hoc si ex arbitrio suo in vita, quanto magis ex iudicio dei post mortem? 15 6. Sed nec omnia opera [optima] cum carnis ministerio anima partitur; nam et solos cogitatus et nudas voluntates censura divina persequitur. f. 166 Qui viderit/ ad concupiscendum, iam adulteravit in corde. Ergo vel propter haec congruentissimum est animam, licet non expectata carne, puniri, quod non sociata carne 20 commisit. Sic et ob cogitatus pios et benivolos, in quibus carne non eguit, sine carne recreabitur. 7. Quid nunc, si et in carnalibus prior est quae concipit, quae disponit, quae mandat, quae impellit? Et si quando invita, prior tamen tractat quod per corpus actura est; nunquam denique conscientia posterior erit facto. Ita huic quoque ordini 25 competit eam priorem pensare mercedes cui priori debeantur. 8. In summa, cum carcerem illum, quem evangelium demonstrat, inferos intellegimus et novissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum mora resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos salva resurrectionis plenitudine 30 per carnem quoque. Hoc etiam paracletus frequentissime commendavit,

18. Mtth. 5, 28. 27. Mtth. 5, 25/6.

1. otium *A*; *approbat Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,89* etiam *B Gel* 2. quid amplius? vis *Iun* quid? ampliorem vis *Urs* quid, amplius vis *Oehl* esse *om. A*; *add. alia m. eiusdem aetatis* post, mortem *distinxi* post mortem, *libri omnes* confusam spem *Oehl*; *vindicat Hoppe Gnom. 11 (1935), 253* 5. gaudeat] *geat A*
6. in laeso *B* 8. importuna tunc *B Gel* 11. ad *om. A* praeterunt *Iun* 13. et dolere et gaudere *Pam* 14. et inlaesa] et *om. B Gel* 15. invita *B* 16. optima *A B*; *om. Gel* optivo *Rfd*; *Hoppe Beitr. 82/3 dubitat, utrum optima delendum sit an non* partitur *Bmg Gel*] patitur *A B* 19. vel *om. Pam* haec] -c *via legibile est in A* hoc *Gel* 20. puniri . . carne *om. A* 21. benevolos *B Gel* in quibus] quibus *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,90 et Hoppe Beitr. 83, putantes A in omittere quod falso renuntiat Rfd* 22. Quid nunc] Quidni *Hartel Patr. Stud. 4,90* in *om. A* 23. desponit *A* 24. numquam *A* 25. ordine *Iun* 26. eam] etiam *Gel* priores *B* (priori *Bmg*) debeatur *A* 27. quem *Urs*] quod *A B Gel* 28. intelligamus *Urs* quodque *Rig* 29. interpretemur *Urs* 30. ad animam *A* salvare . resurrectionis *A* 31. per] praeter *Iun susp.* paraclitus *A*

si qui sermones eius ex agnitione promissorum charismatum admiserit.
 9. Ad omnem, ut arbitror, humanam super anima opinionem ex doctrina fidei congressi iustae dumtaxat ac necessariae curiositati satisfacimus; enormi autem et otiosae tantum deerit discere quantum

5 libuerit inquirere.

1. quis *B Gel* 3. curiositati *Iun]* curiositatis *A B Gel* 4. satisfacimus *Lat]* fecimus *A Bmg* faciemus *B* satisfaciemus *Gel* satisfacimus *Urs*
 5. TERTULLIANI DE CENSU ANIMAE EXPLICIT *A*
 Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani libri de anima finis *B*

1—3. PREFACE: PAGAN PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

1. *The value of the discussion of the immortality of the soul in Plato's PHAEDO.*

“After my polemics against Hermogenes concerning the origin of the soul I now turn to the remaining problems, in which I shall be forced to take up arms against philosophy (§ 1). — The immortality of the soul was even discussed by Socrates in prison. This leads us to the question whether the discussion was held at a suitable time, for we can hardly assume that at that moment the soul of Socrates was able to think clearly: even if it was outwardly calm, it must have been unsettled by the very endeavour not to let itself be unsettled. Moreover, its chief purpose was to find a consolation for the injustice suffered, or rather to show its contempt for it (§ 2). It was for this reason that Socrates showed equanimity before Xanthippe; and it was for the purpose of killing the joy of his accusers over their recent victory that he postulated the immortality of the soul (§ 3). Thus his entire wisdom sprang from a premeditated striving after equanimity, not from knowledge of revealed truth, with which an unbaptized pagan could not be familiar. It was not Holy Spirit speaking through him, but an evil spirit, viz. his *daemonium* (§ 4); for in those times Christianity, which alone is able to break the power of the demons, had not yet manifested itself (§ 5). How superior to this wisdom of the school of Socrates is the wisdom of the school of heaven: while denying the existence of all the gods of this world, it does not create new demons, but casts out the old <by exorcizing them>; it does not corrupt youth, but educates it in the most virtuous way, and suffers cruel persecution, not only from one city, as did Socrates, but from the whole world! In the discussion of the human soul, too, a Christian will conform to the rules laid down by God, convinced that things obtained from God can only be taught by God himself (§ 6)”.

According to Tert., the exposition on the immortality of the soul given by Socrates was of no value, because it was not based upon the knowledge of revealed truth, but had sprung from the wish to kill the joy of his adversaries over their victory; for the demonstration of the immortality of the soul could defraud the death-sentence of its significance. Similarly, Socrates' composure after the verdict is here considered to be unnatural (which in itself is sufficient to render the value of his assertions doubtful), and only to serve the purpose of showing contempt for the sentence. The chapter ends

with a circumstantial comparison of Socrates' wisdom with Christian revelation, which comparison is based on the text of the charge.

As is nearly always the case, Tert. with his argument has the nearest object in view. In the opening sentence he points out that he will be forced to take up arms against philosophy; so by demonstrating at the beginning of his treatise that the statements of the *princeps philosophorum* about the human soul are due to motives not altogether honest, he may *a fortiori* deal a blow to philosophy in general. That not everything stated in the present chapter corresponds to his inner conviction, is shown by *apol.* 14, 7: '*Sed propterea damnatus est Socrates, quia deos destruebat*'. Plane olim, id est semper, veritas odio est (the interpretation of this passage by Heinze (*Apol.*, 364) is not satisfactory; a better explanation is given by Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 152₁₂₂).

It is not necessary to quote further particulars, as the appreciation of Socrates by Christian authors has been the subject of two excellent monographs, viz. A. Harnack, *Socrates und die alte Kirche* (Berlin 1900; for Tert., see p. 17/21), and J. Geffcken, *Sokrates und das alte Christentum* (Heidelberg 1908; for Tert.: p. 25/7); unfortunately, both scholars have neglected to interpret Tert.'s statements from the context in which they occur.

1. *De solo censu animae*: "only about the original essence of the soul". Tert. is the first author to use *census* in the sense of 'origin', a meaning due to the use of *censeri* as an equivalent of *oriri*, which in his works also occurs for the first time (see the note on 20, 1). For more instances, see Thes. l. L. III: 808, 81/809, 27 (add *ad nat.* 2, 12, 26 and *adv. Marc.* 5, 3 (575, 17/8): (ante) *quam ex censu eorum* (sc. *apostolorum*: "from them as originators"; Kroymann wrongly reads *consensu*) *in nationes praedicandi munus subiret*). Here the meaning is: 'the original essence', just as in 38,1, and perhaps also in *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (339, 13/5). For the meaning 'number', 'class', see the note on 8, 1. These words unquestionably refer to the treatise *De censu animae*, this subject not being discussed in *Adversus Hermogenem* (see the Introduction, p. 13*). It is a habit of Tert. to repeat the most important word of the title in the opening sentences of his works, e.g. *ad mart.*: *inter carnis alimenta, benedicti martyres designati*; *idol.*: *principale crimen generis humani . . . idololatria*; *fuga in persec.*: *quaesisti proxime, Fabi frater, fugiendum necne sit in persecutione*; cf., moreover, the first sentences of the treatises *spect.*, *orat.*, *pat.*, *v. v.*, *c. Chr.*, *res.*, *scorp.*, *adv. Iud.*, *adv. Marc.* 1, 2, 4, and *testim. anim.*; in *pud.*, *paen.*, and *adv. Val.*, the subst. from the title is even used as the very first word of the opening sentence. — *Hermogeni*: the use of the dat. after *congregari* is poetical (for the first time in Verg. *Aen.* 1, 475; see Thes. l. L. IV: 287, 28/44): it is not necessary to regard this as a Grecism in analogy of συνίστασθαι τι, as Hoppe does (*serm. Tert.*, 12; on the other hand, the occurrence of a Grecism is unquestionable in Iren. lat. 1 *praef.*: *quibusdam . . . ipsorum . . . congressus*, where the original text preserved by Epiphanius has συμβαλόν). The combination *congregari de aliqua re* is only found

in Tert.'s works (Thes., *loc. cit.*, 1. 68 *seqq.*). — *quatenus* has causal sense (which occurs from Lucr. 2, 927 and 3, 218.424 downwards; in prose it occurs for the first time in Val. Max. 9, 11 *pr.*); cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 82/3. — *et istum*, sc. *sicut cetera omnia ex materia orta putat*. *iste* has the sense of *hic*, which is extremely frequent in Tert.'s works (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 104; Löfst., *Apol.*, 23). — *ex materiae* . . . *suggestu*: *suggestus* is explained differently. According to Pamelius, it is synonymous here with *ornatus*, La Cerda paraphrases it by "*supparatura et subministratio et sufficientia materiae*", Kellner and Hoppe (*Synt.*, 124) translate it by 'influence', Hauschild (*Psychol. Tert.'s*, 9) by 'congestion' ('Anhäufung'), and Esser, 35, by 'foundation' ('Grundlage'), whereas Engelbrecht in his excellent discussion on the much-varied use of this word in Tert.'s works (Wiener Stud. 28 (1906), 50/8) considers *ex suggestu materiae* to be equivalent to *ex subministratio materiae* ("Hermogenes hat angenommen, dass die Seele nicht aus dem Hauche Gottes, sondern dadurch entstanden sei, dass dem Körper eine Materie zugeführt wurde"). The last-mentioned interpretation seems to be mainly correct, though the assumption that *suggestus* has a strongly verbal sense here is wrong. The words *flatus dei* are not used in this sense here, because they denote the *substantia animae*; similarly, *suggestus materiae* either means *materia subministrata* or 'an accumulation, a lump of matter' (cf. Engelbrecht, 55/6). The former interpretation is supported by the fact that it is only on account of parallelism that Tert. writes *ex materiae suggestu* instead of *ex materia* (Engelbrecht justly refers to 3, 4: *ex dei flatu* . . . *non ex materia*). — *constitisse*, i. e. *ortum esse*; the perfect tense has ingressive sense as in *adv. Val.* 24 (201, 6/7): *sequitur, ut limum ex pituitis et gramis Sophiae constitisse credamus*; *ib.* 15 (194, 14); 39 (211, 18); *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 5). Moreover, the choice of the perfect may also be due to the fact that the governing verb has the same tense (see the note on 35, 3), and to the clausula. — *ad* . . . *conversus*: a very common expression in Tert.'s works, for which see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 98/9. — *videbor dimicaturus* is equivalent to *videor dimicaturus* (the alternative, viz. the meaning *videbor dimicans*, 'I shall be seen fighting', is much less probable, because in *de anim.*, where it occurs 27 times, *videri* never has passive meaning; it is frequently almost a pleonasm, as in the present passage). To my knowledge, no perfect parallels are found in other authors, though of course such passages may be adduced as Cato *agr.* 30: *ubi sementim facturus eris*, for which cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 556; Leumann, 343; Salonijs, *Vit. Patr.*, 282. For cases like Plaut. *Miles* 395: *narrandum ego istic militi censebo*, where the future tense of the governing verb is due to the gerundive dependent on it, see Sjögren, *Fut.*, 233. For a similar case, see the note on *vivent* in 10, 5.

2. *Socratis*: after mentioning the philosophers in general Tert. turns to the *princeps philosophorum* (see the preface to this chapter). — *velitatum est*: the metaphorical use of this verb is proper to archaic Latin (Plaut. *Men.* 778) and to the archaists (Apul., Gell.). — *nescio* . . .

magistri: two interpretations of these words may be tempted. Firstly, we may join the genit. *magistri* on to *tempore*, which is certainly peculiar, but finds a parallel in Curt. 7, 7, 10: *me . . . occupavit meliore hostium quam meo tempore*. In this case *magister* is almost equivalent to a proper name (just as in ch. 4 Plato is called *philosophus* without any further comment). Perhaps we may find a transition to this use in Pers. 4, 1/2: *barbatum . . . magistrum . . . sorbitio tollit quem dira cicuta* (however, we should not forget that Socrates is addressing Alcibiades); Val. Max. 3, 4 ext. 1: (Socrates) *si virtus per se ipsam aestimetur, vitae magister optimus*; cf. also Aug. civ. dei 18, 37: *Socrates Atheniensis, magister omnium, qui tunc maxime claruerunt*; C G L V: 447, 28: *comum cicuta, veneni genus, quod philosophus bibit*, and Cyprian's famous words *Da magistrum*. This interpretation finds support in the fact that Tert. by his attack on the *sapientiae princeps* (Min. Fel. 13, 1) wishes to deal a blow to philosophy in general. However, if we consider Tert.'s style, the interpretation by Borleffs (Museum 41 (1934), 412), who puts a comma after *est* and connects *magistri* with *Socratis* (*Socratis . . . nescio . . . an o. i. t. magistri*, sc. ὄντος), is certainly preferable. Cf. e. g. 12, 3: *Aristoteles . . . nescio an sua paratior implere quam aliena inanire* (likewise, in *apol.* 39, 12/3: *Socratis et . . . Catonis qui uxores suas amicis communicaverunt . . . Nescio quidem an invitas*, a comma should be put before *nescio*). *Nescio an* has negative meaning here: 'probably not'; for this sense, which is found from Sen. *controv.* and Val. Max. downwards, see F. Westerburg, *De formulis dubitanter decernendi, quales sunt haud scio an, dubito an* (thesis Giessen 1923, only in manuscript); Kühn.-Stegm. 2, 522; Hofm., *Synt.*, 697. From Tert.'s works, cf. *an.* 10, 4; 12, 3; 24, 3; 48, 4; *adv. Marc.* 1, 29 (332, 11); 2, 27 (374, 12); 4, 39 (558, 5); *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 4; *pat.* 7 (12, 9). The positive meaning is found in *paen.* 6, 20; in *ad nat.* 2, 7, 1 the sense is not clear. — *etsi . . . interest*: "the fact that the discussion took place in jail is not important, but the moment was quite unsuitable". The expression *de loco non interest* is frequently found in juridical language (for the marriage-ceremony, see F. Norden, *Apuleius und das römische Privatrecht*, 102/3); Tert. seems to have a predilection for it. In *spect.* 8 (10, 10) he makes his opponent say: *nulla est praescriptio de locis*, to which he replies (10, 20/1): *loca nos non contaminant per se, sed quae in locis fiunt*. Cf. also *ib.* 10 (12, 5/6); 15 (16, 16/7); *an.* 20, 2; *pud.* 4 (225, 24/5): *sicut nec locis* (*de locis* Hartel, *Patr. Stud.* 4, 17, which may be right) *refert, in cubiculis an in turribus pudicitia trucidetur*; *orat.* 24 ('prayer may take place *omni loco*'; here, however, the influence of 1 Tim. 2, 8 should also be considered). The juridical character of this expression is particularly clear in *cor.* 1, 35/7: *ubi autem prohibemur coronari? hanc magis localem substantiam causae praesentis aggrediar*. The combination of *locus* and *tempus*, which is also frequent in Tert.'s works (e. g. *an.* 4; *fuga* 1, 1; *spect.* 28 = 27, 1/2), is also due to the influence of the idiom of lawyers. For *interest de*, cf. 25, 2. — *tunc* has the function of an adj. as in 31, 4: *proelia tunc Graeciae* and 36, 4: *illam tunc Adae portionem*; it should of course be connected with *anima*, for in the

latter part of the sentence Tert. explains why Socrates' soul could not possibly be at rest at that moment. As to the position of the words, cf. e. g. *spect.* 1 (1, 13): *tanta solacia extrinsecus oculorum* ("external allurements to the eyes"); *paen.* 12, 3: *ignis intrinsecus fetu* (*feti* Borleffs); *apol.* 18,5: *Demetrii Phalerei, grammaticorum tunc probatissimi*. For further details, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 467 (who rightly points out that it is wrong to regard all instances of this way of using an adverb as Grecisms); Kühn-Stegm., 1, 218 *seqq.*; Kroll's note on Catull. 4, 10; Klotz on [Caes.] *bell. Hispan.* 24, 6; Freund, 54; for the later period, see von Geisau, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 36 (1916), 280/1; Svenn., *Oros.*, 99/100 and *Pallad.*, 397/8; Chruzander, 57; Stix, 30 and 35; Mossberg, 89₂; Gabarrou, 163/4; Juret, *Filastr.* 61; for Tert., cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.* 20/1; *Tert.*, 15; Waltz., 49; Thörn., *St. Tert.*, 1, 71. Several instances may be added, e. g. the adjectival use of *retro* (c. *Chr.* 7, 67; *adv. Marc.* 1,8 (300, 6); *orat.* 1 (180, 12); *cult. fem.* 2, 9, 4 (cf. Kok, 178); *res.* 63 (125, 12/3); perhaps also *adv. Iud.* 8, 108), *quandoque* (*test. anim.* 4 = 140, 10), *deinceps* (*iei.* 13 = 292, 12), and perhaps also of *interim* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 23/4): *qui nec notitiam sui aliquo interim opere curaverit*) and *supra* (*res.* 49 (103, 13): *sine ullius supra sensus praestruccione*). — *iam . . . regresso*: Plato *Phaedo* 58 A. — *iam . . . exhaustis*: the right explanation was given by La Cerda and Lindner; the latter scholar gives this interpretation: "mane Socrati nuntiatum erat, sub vespere cicutas ipsi bibendas fore; ita iam ante ipsas cicutas damnationis cruciatus exhausterat". The *cicuta damnationis* ("the verdict had poisoned Socrates' soul") are opposed to the *cicuta mortis* (cf. *poculum mortis* Cic. *pro Cluentio* 31); cf. also *aconito hostilitatis*, *pall.* 2, 7. Rigaltius regards these words as alluding to the view that a man condemned was considered already virtually dead, *pro mortuo*; for this view he refers to Theophylact. in *Ioann.* 19, 12: ἔκτοτε σταυρῶσαι καὶ τιμωρῆσαι οἱ δικασταὶ λέγονται, ἀφ'οὗ τὴν ἀπόφασιν ἐξενέγκωσι, διὰ τὸ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς τιμωρίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου ἐν ταῖς γλώσσαις κεκτῆσθαι (cf. also [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 65: *omnis enim qui addicitur morti, ex eo iam mortuus computatur, quo sententiam excipit*). However, in this case the combination *damnationis cicutis* would be surprising, as we should rather expect *post damnationem* or *ipsa damnatione cicutis exhaustis*. — *consternata . . . non secundum naturam*: Latinus' conjecture *motum* (*modum* B Gel) is certainly right, for Tert. refers to the well-known Stoic definitions of ὁρμή and πάθος; cf. e. g. *St. V. F.* 3, frag. 377; *ib.* 412 (Diog. Laërt. 7, 110): ἔστι δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος κατὰ Ζήνωνα ἡ ἄλογος καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ψυχῆς κίνησις (Tert. *anima . . . consternata ad aliquem motum*) ἢ ὁρμή πλεονάζουσα. For the *motus secundum naturam*, which corresponds to ὁρμή or ὁρεξις (*ib.* 3, frag. 442: τὴν δὲ ὁρεξιν ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ἀναγκαίων, λογικὴν ὑπάρχουσιν κίνησιν), cf. also *ib.* frag. 418 (Plut. *de Stoic. repugn.* 25): καθ' ἐτέρας δὲ φυσικὰς φορὰς ἐκτρεπομένων ὁ ἔλεος γίνεται, frag. 464, and Cic. *de fato* 25/6. — *externata*: for this participle, which occurs from Catull. 64, 165 downwards, see J. Meltzer, *Externare und externare* (A. L. L., 3, 542/5). That the difference between *consternatus* and

externatus was not great, is evident from Nonius 108: *externavit* (Catull. 64, 71) *ut consternavit, id est dementem fecit*. — *si non secundum naturam*, sc. *mota*. Tert. obviously wishes to avoid the repetition of *ad aliquem motum*. — *Quamvis*, etc.: the argument in this paragraph and the next may be summed up in the following way: "It is out of the question that the soul of Socrates should be perfectly calm indeed, as it was either perturbed by a natural movement, viz. the fear of death, or even by an unnatural one. <The latter possibility is more probable, because we may indeed state an unnatural element in his state of mind at that moment.> For though it is true that outwardly he was perfectly calm, we may be sure that this equanimity, which had sprung from the desire not to let himself be perturbed, required such an amount of mental energy that it may be qualified as a violent concussion <, and, moreover, as an unnatural one on account of its being forced>. The wish not to show any lack of balance had proceeded from Socrates' desire to manifest contempt for the verdict, by means of which he sought to kill the joy of his accusers; this is evident (*Denique*) both from his cheerfulness on meeting Xanthippe (*de gratulatione*) and from the nature of his reply to her ('*volebas autem iuste?*'). So it is clear that the entire discussion recorded in the *Phaedo* should be considered in the same way: both the tranquillity shown by the courage to discuss the immortality of the soul in the face of death and the view upheld in this discussion were meant as an *insultatio* (or even *frustratio*) *iniuriae*. Hence it may be concluded that the wisdom of the *princeps philosophorum* with regard to the soul had sprung from a premeditated equanimity <, which in its turn was subservient to the wish to 'insult the injury'>". The point of the argument is to be found in the words *mota, ne moveretur*: originally Tert. only wished to prove that the soul of Socrates was perturbed, and so was quite incapable of discussing a philosophic theme; since the cause of this perturbation arose from the desire not to be perturbed at all, the main stress is laid on this intention, which in the next sentence is represented as subservient to the *desiderium iniuriae insultandae*. It is not quite clear whether *enim* (*Quamvis enim placida*, etc.) refers to *consternata . . . non secundum naturam* or only to the latter part of this passage (*externata, si non secundum naturam*), in other words, whether Tert. only argues that the soul of Socrates was perturbed, or moreover means to say that this perturbation was an unnatural one. The former interpretation finds support in the fact that he only writes *mota*; since, however, Tert. usually carries on the thought last expressed by him, and since the reasons enumerated in the preceding sentence (*iam sacro . . . praesente*) only refer to the fear of death, which must be regarded as a 'natural movement' and in the sequel is not given as the chief cause of Socrates' *concussio*, the latter explanation seems to be preferable. — *vir quilibet*: 'any man', as opposed to a philosopher. — *nedum philosophus*, sc. "*aliud quid quam solamen, vel potius insultationem iniuriae saperet*". A man unjustly condemned would only think of a consolation for the injustice suffered by him, and so would not be able to have

clear and calm thoughts about a philosophical theme; a philosopher on account of his thirst for glory would seek for a means to show his scorn of the injustice and hence would be still more incapable of philosophical discussion. — *gloriae animal*: for *animal*, cf. Vahlen's discussion (*Opusc. Acad.* 2, 228) of Theocr. 15, 145: τὸ χρῆμα σοφώτερον, ἢ θηλεία. The simple genit. is also found in *frag. Fuld.* 6: *gloriae homines* (see Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 107/8); with a pronoun *pat.* 1 (2, 3/4): *philosophi . . . qui alicuius sapientiae animalia deputantur* (Kroymann wrongly adopts Ursinus' conjecture *animalis*). These passages were copied by Hier. *ep.* 66, 8, 3: *philosophus, gloriae animal et popularis aurae atque rumorum venale mancipium*; *ib.* 118, 5, 2; 43, 2, 1: *ventris animalia* (as far as I know, only one other instance of this use of a simple genit. *qualitatis* after *animal* can be quoted, viz. Boëth. *consol.* 2, 5, 25: *divinum merito rationis animal = animal rationale, ζῷον λογικόν*). A different case is found in *bapt.* 8, 3, where *animal simplicitatis et innocentiae* denotes the dove. Further particulars about the use of a genit. *qualitatis* without an attribute are to be found in Hofm., *Synt.*, 399; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 85/9; Löfst., *loc. cit.*; E. Glässer, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 58 (1941/2), 233/42. The thirst for glory of the philosophers is frequently mentioned in Christian apologetics. From Tert. we may quote *an.* 2, 2; *apol.* 46, 18: (philosophus) *jamae negotiator*; *ib.* 47, 3: *homines gloriae . . . et eloquentiae solius libidinosi*; *ib.* 46, 7; *ad nat.* 2, 2, 5; *praescr.* 14, 11/2; moreover, cf. Justin 1, 57 (for which passage see Lortz, 2, 87₁₀₁); Tatian. *orat.* 2 (2, 18/9 Schwartz) and 12 (13, 12/3); Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 3, 3, 14; Method. *de resurr.* 2, 30, 1 (386, 16/8 Bonwetsch); Hier. *ad Galat.* 5, 26; Aug. *de quant. anim.* 14, 24 and *civ. dei* 18, 41, 1. — *cui . . . iniuria: consolari* is connected with a non- personal object for the first time by Cic., *pro Quinctio* 5 (Thes. 1. L. IV: 480, 48 *seqq.*); from Tert. cf. *scorp.* 11 (170, 21/2): *passiones consolatur illorum*, and *spect.* 12 (14, 19): *ita mortem homicidiis consolabantur* (for further details, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 127/8). The passage was copied inaccurately by Hier. *ep.* 60, 4, 2: *in consolationem damnationis suae Socrates disputavit in carcere*.

3. *Denique*: 'for instance': by his cheerfulness and his *affectata constantia* (*ad mart.* 6) Socrates wanted to show to Xanthippe that he made light of the condemnation, which he also qualified as unjust. For this meaning of *denique* (which is found from Fronto p. 40, 6 Naber downwards and is fairly frequent in the works of Jct.), see Thes. 1. L. V, 1: 533, 68/534, 9. — *iniuste*: Diog. Laërt. 2, 35: τῆς γυναικὸς εἰπούσης, ἀδίκως ἀποθνήσκεις, σὺ δέ', ἔφη, δικαίως ἐβούλου; Val. Max. 7, 2 *ext.* 1 (in Xen. *apol.* 28 these words were addressed by Socrates to Apollodorus). — *de gratulatione = gaudens*; *de* is joined on to a modal ablative (for more instances, see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 45, 48); *gratulatio* is equivalent to *gaudium* (from Cic. *Pis.* 40; *dom.* 62 downwards; cf. Thes. 1. L. VI, 2: 2250, 34 *seqq.*), just as in *cor.* 9, 7. For the use of *gratulari* in the sense of *gaudere* in Tert., see Hartel, *op. cit.*, 2, 26₂. — *et in carcere*: as opposed to *post sententiam* in the preceding sentence. — *inviscatas . . . palmas . . . infringere*: the right

explanation was given by Oehler: "*inviscatae* igitur erunt palmae technis et dolosis artificiis paratae, ut visco utuntur in aucupio"; Hartel is certainly wrong in writing (48): "*inviscatae* werden aber passend *Anyti et Meleti palmae* ('hands' according to Hartel) genannt, an denen sich Sokrates gefangen hatte" (thus also La Cerda, who paraphrases *inviscatas* by *captatrices* and Kroymann, *Gnomon* 16 (1940), 38: "Diese 'mit Vogelleim bestrichenen' Hände des Anytos und Meletos möchten den Sokrates im Kerker festhalten"). That *palmae* must here mean the palms of victory is proved, apart from the context, by the use of *infringere*, cf. e. g. Curt. 9, 2, 29: *ne infringeris in manibus meis palmam qua Herculem Liberumque patrem . . . aequabo*; Cic. *pro Balbo* 15: *ipsum florem dignitatis infringere*; Ovid *met.* 10, 190/1. We should not quote Lucil. 796 Marx: *omnia viscatis manibus leget* as a parallel, the palms not being *captatrices* (La Cerda), but *dolo captatae*: they had been caught with the lime-twigs, and during the time that Sokrates was arguing in prison, some glue was still sticking to them. So Bickel's conjecture *impiscatas* is mainly right; he has only overlooked the fact that in antiquity the catching of birds was as popular a pastime as angling is to-day, and so might be used metaphorically; cf. also the note on 39, 1: *spiritus nequam . . . animas aucupabundus*. The only matter for doubt is whether we should translate "caught with the limetwig" (this interpretation is supported by the gloss quoted by Oehler ('ap. Ang. Mai tom. VII class. auct. p. 615', not found in the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*) *et componitur invisco as, id est per viscus aliquid capere*) or "still sticky with glue", 'recens a visco', cf. e. g. Ovid *ars* 1, 391: *non avis utiliter viscatis effugit alis*; the alternative seems to be more in keeping with Tert.'s particular sense of humour. In Romance languages *inviscare*, which occurs here for the first time (see Rönsch, *It.*², 128, 205; the intransitive meaning is found in Cass. Fel. p. 26, 21), retains the meaning: 'to make something sticky', e. g. Dante *Inf.* 21, 17/8: *... una pegola spessa, che 'nviscava la ripa d' ogni parte* (*ib.* 22, 144; *Parad.* 17, 32). For *inglutinare*, see Svonn., *Oribas.*, 89. — *gestiens . . . vindicans*: the constitution of the text is not quite clear here; nor is it probable, the first chapters not being extant in the *Codex Agobardinus*, that it will one day be possible to restore Tert.'s original words. To retain the readings *in te inviscatas* and *gestio* given by B. Kroymann (*Gnomon* 16 (1940), 38) proposes to write: *si et in carcere: 'in te', in<quit>, 'viscatas Anyti et Meleti palmas gestio infringere'*. This, however, is impossible, for in this case we must either suppose that the next words are spoken by Tert. again, which gives a most abrupt transition (a dash before *ipsa*?), or that Sokrates himself reveals the real purpose of the entire discussion, which is still more improbable. Since *Bmg*, which often agrees with A, has *gestiens*, this reading must certainly be preferred to *gestio*, which is unintelligible. In this case two participles are found after *nihil mirandum*, *si*, viz. *gestiens* and *vindicans* (B Gel). This is peculiar, for which reason Reifferscheid writes *gestit* and Latinus *vindicat*; Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 45/6) gives the following explanation: "In beiden Fällen liegt Ellipse von

erat vor (die beim Part. auch sonst vorkommt) Die Partizipien stehen vielmehr asyndetisch, durch die Voranstellung von *ipsa morte* vor *coram* aber wird das Asyndeton gemildert". This interpretation cannot be right, for Tert. wishes to point out here that Socrates by upholding the immortality of the soul had a well-defined purpose, viz. *iniuriam insultare* (the words *ad iniuriae frustrationem* point back to *iniuria* . . . *insultanda* in § 2); so the two participles are not on the same level. It seems best to regard *vindicans* as the principal idea, and the words *inviscatas* . . . *infringere* (which means the same as *iniuriae frustratio*) as equivalent to a causal clause. Thus the discussion recorded in the *Phaedo* is represented as an obvious (*Quo nihil mirandum*) consequence of Socrates' wish to kill the joy of his accusers, as is his reply to Xanthippe, which served the same purpose, viz. *iniuriam insultare* (the use of *et* before *in carcere* clearly shows that the wish "to break the palms of victory of Meletus and Anytus" was still alive in him *post sententiam*, etc.). Thus the only remaining difficulty is the occurrence of a present participle instead of an indicative in a hypothetical clause; however, in Tert.'s works this use is not uncommon in subordinate clauses in general, e.g. 25, 6: *quia et ipsum vocabulum animae penes Graecos de refrigeratione respondens; ad nat. 1, 7, 15: quid, cum domestici eos vobis prodentes?; ib. 2, 13, 6: aut enim ille, quisquis id praestans, facit;* for further particulars, see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 41₃; 3, 9; 4, 49. 65; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 21/2. A participle instead of an indicative after *si* is also found in 18, 2: *si egressus*, where Reifferscheid adopts Rigaltius' conjecture *segressus*. In the later period of the language this superseding of an indicative by a participle becomes more and more frequent; it also occurs in principal sentences (there, however, the participle is mostly co-ordinated to an indicative, e.g. Vict. Vit. 2, 24: *cremantes gravi suspensio atque ingentia pondera pedibus contigantes, lamminasque ignitas dorso . . . adponebant*). This subject not having been satisfactorily described, it may be profitable to give a fairly detailed account of the relevant literature: Hofm., *Synt.*, 606; Löfst., *Per.*, 158/9 and 249; Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 73; Juret, *Filastr.*, 127; Petschenig, index to Vict. Vit., p. 165; Müller-Marquardt, 218; Geyer, *Erläut.*, 25; Bellanger, 107/110; Bonnet, 651/2; Werner, 89/90; Pirson, 430; Haag, 922/3; Elss, 41; Leo, index to Venant. Fortun., p. 411; Blomgren, *Stud. Fort.* 1, 107 *seqq.* 2, 67. 99; Svenn., *Oros.*, 84/5 and *Pallad.*, 433/6; Horn, 75/7. 97; Tidn., *Did.*, 68/9. 143₂; Blatt, 32; Cavallin, 77/8; Biese, 82; Pfister, *Rh. Mus.* 67 (1912), 207; for the same use in Greek, see Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 205; Vireau, *Ét. sur le grec du N T*, 203; Moulton, 352 *seqq.* — *immortalitatem vindicans animae* is the most plausible reading, for in 54, 1 we find *philosophi . . . qui immortalitatem animae . . . vindicant*. As in the above passage, it is not certain whether *animae* is to be interpreted as a dative (cf. 5, 1; 6, 6; 11, 1; 17, 10) or as a genitive (15, 2: *sensus, quorum vindicatur principale*). — *necessaria praesumptione*: this ablative is nearly equivalent to an apposition; see the note on 19,5.

4. **Adeo** serves as an introduction to the conclusion, and so is almost synonymous with *ideo*; this meaning occurs for the first time in the imperial period (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 115, refers to Sen. *ep.* 42, 7; for Celsus, see Brolén, 35/6, for the later period, Ahlquist, 115/21, *Thes. l. L.* I: 612, 16 *seqq.* (*adeo . . . quod*) and 616, 29/34 (altogether inadequate), Stangl, *BPhW* 35 (1915), 64 and *Cassiodor.*, 257/8, Martin, *Wkl Ph* 35 (1918), 19, and Sverinn., *Pallad.*, 306₂); however, an isolated instance is already found in Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 8, 15, 2 (Caelius; see Ahlquist, 116/7). In Tert.'s works this use of *adeo* is extremely frequent. — **tunc** once more has the function of an adjunct. (see comm. on § 2: *anima tunc Socratis*). — **de . . . venerat**: for the use of *venire ab, de, ex* in Tert., see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 75₄ (add *an.* 10, 2; *praescr.* 2, 17 and 22, 3/4), for Cypr., Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 109, for Novatianus, Koch, *Novat.*, 283. — **industria . . . aequanimitatis: consultus** here means 'intentional', 'premeditated', which meaning is found for the first time in Gell. 11, 1, 7: *consulta elegantia* (for the expressions *consulto consilio* and *opera consulta*, which likewise occur for the first time in Gell., see Landgraf, *De figuris etymol. ling. Lat.* (Acta semin. philol. Erlang. 2, 1881), 48). The circumstantiality of the expression (we should expect *de consulta aequanimitate* or *de aequanimitate consulto* (*de industria*) *suscepta*) is once more due to parallelism (∞ *de fiducia compertae veritatis*); cf. the note on *ex materiae . . . suggestu* in § 1. Consequently, *aequanimitatis* is to be regarded as a possessive, not as an objective genit., so that the parallelism is not perfect, *veritatis* being an objective genit.; numerous instances of such a parallelism may be quoted from Tert.'s works (cf. e.g. 2, 4 *aut adiuvari falsis aut patrocinari* and 50, 3). — **non . . . veritatis**: though this statement is intelligible from the context, it is not impossible that Tert. (who certainly had read the *Phaedo*, see Introduction, p. 44₆*) here has in view Socrates' words in *Phaedo* 91 B: εἰ μὲν τυγχάνει ἀληθῆ ὄντα ἃ λέγω, καλῶς δὴ ἔχει τὸ πεισθῆναι· εἰ δὲ μηδὲν ἐστὶ τελευτήσαντι, ἀλλ' οὖν τοῦτόν γε τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν τὸν πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἦττον τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀηδὴς ἔσομαι ὀδυρόμενος. The *veritas* (*Christiana*) leads Tert. to the *spiritus sanctus* (probably in accordance with the Montanistic view, which regarded him as the *paracletus*, *deductor omnis veritatis*; see the note on 58, 8), and thence to the *spiritus nequam*, which as a *daemonium* lodged in Socrates. — **accommodatus**: the right explanation is given by La Cerda: "alludit ad concessionem Spiritus Sancti in baptismo, sive confirmatione, qui accommodatis super capita manibus donabatur olim etiam visibili descensu". A parallel is furnished by *bapt.* 8, 1: *dehinc manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans et invitans spiritum sanctum. sane humano ingenio licebit spiritum in aquam arcessere et concorporationem eorum accommodatis desuper manibus alio spiritu tantae claritatis animare: deo autem in suo organo non licebit per manus sanctas sublimitatem modulari spiritalem?* — **sine fidei sacramento**, viz. baptism (*bapt.* 7, 2: *quomodo et ipsius baptismi carnalis actus quod in aqua mergimur, spiritalis effectus quod delictis liberamur*; see K. Rahner, *Ztschr. f. Kathol. Theol.* 60 (1936), 496). Cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 28 (329, 25/9):

o deum (sc. Marcionis) *usquequaque perversum*...! *cuius non statum, non condicionem*... *video consistere, iam nec ipsum fidei eius sacramentum*. *cui enim rei baptismus quoque apud eum exigitur?* In *bapt.* 1, 1 and 12, 3 baptism is called *sacramentum aquae* (*ib.* 9, 1: *in baptismi sacramento*); on the other hand, the *adversarii* oppose the *fidei sacramentum* of Abraham to baptism (*ib.* 13, 1); cf. also *Aug. de nupt. et concup.* 1, 10, 11: *etiam fide perditam sacramentum fidei non amittit, quod lavacro regenerationis accepit*. The word *sacramentum* by itself occurs with this meaning in *ad mart.* 3: *cum in sacramenti verba respondemus* and *cor.* 13, 45/6: *omnes* (sc. *causae*) *alienae, profanae, illicitae, semel iam in sacramenti testatione eieratae*. For the meaning of *sacramentum* in Tert.'s works, which is a much-discussed question still, see A. Hahn, *Theol.-kirchl. Annalen* 1 (1842), 77/105. 157/85; C. Leimbach, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1871, 484 *seqq.*; A. Réville, *Du sens du mot sacramentum dans Tertullien* (*Bibl. éc. haut. ét., sc. relig.* 1 (1889), 195/204); Kattenbusch, *Das apostol. Symbol*, 2, 53/101; A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 33/4. 59/69; H. von Soden, *ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ und sacramentum in den ersten zwei Jahrh. der Kirche*, *ZNTW* 12 (1911), 188/227 (for Tert. 205 *seqq.*); E. de Backer, *Sacramentum. Le mot et l'idée*... *dans Tert.* (Louvain 1911); d'Alès, *Théol.*, 321/3; Anrich, *Mysterienrelig.*, 147/9; de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum*, 66 *seqq.*; Adam, *Kirch. Tert.*, 75₄; Dölger, *Sacramentum militiae*, *A Ch* 2 (1930), 268/80; Sainio, 75/86; Rönsch, *N.T.T.*, 585/6 and *It.*², 323; for this passage, cf. von Soden, 211₄. A similar sequence of sentences is frequently found in Tert.'s works, e.g. in *adv. Marc.* 4, 17 (633, 1/2). — *facilius* = *citius potius*; this meaning only occurs in Tert.'s works (*Thes. l. L. VI*: 68, 45 *seqq.*; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 73). — *agebatur*: cf. *apol.* 23, 4: *aliqui*... *quem daemone agi constet*; *scorp.* 8 (161, 6/7): *qui spiritu dei agebantur*; Lucif. Calaur. *de non parc.* 28 (270, 14/5 H.): *tu*... *qui nunc diverso ageris spiritu*. — *adhaesisse*, viz. as a δαίμων πάρεδρος (see the comm. on § 5). — *paedagogum*: the choice of this qualification is of course due to the preceding *a puero*. — *post*... *deputantur*: this was copied from *apol.* 46, 5: *cum secundum deos philosophi daemones deputent*. The addition of *cum deis* in this passage is caused by the context, for after *etsi* the information that the demons are regarded as coming immediately next to the gods would not suffice to create an antithesis to the words *pessimum*... *paedagogum*. — *penes*... *philosophos*: the juxtaposition of poets and philosophers as propagators of false views about the gods seems to occur for the first time in the polemical writings of the Epicureans (e.g. *Cic. nat. deor.* 1, 42; see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 45₃. 77. 171; where the same combination is found in works of the Stoics, it has a totally different meaning); probably it is from these philosophers that Christian apologists borrowed it, cf. *Aristid.* 13, 5; *Justin apol.* 1, 20, 3/4; 1, 44, 9. 54; [*Justin*] *cohort. ad Graec.* 1/4; *Athenag. legat.* 7. 24; *Theophil. ad Autolyc.* 1, 14; 2, 8. 12. 38; 3, 7; *Min. Fel.* 19, 1/3; 26, 9; *Tert. apol.* 23, 13; 47, 11/3; 49, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 40/1; *test. anim.* 1 (134, 5) and 5 (141, 9); *Clem. Alex. strom.* 5, 8, 50, 2, etc.; *Hier. adv. Rufin.* 3, 42; *Filastr.* 100, 1. 103, 3. 125,

3. For further particulars, see Heinze, *Apol.*, 360 and Wendland, *Kultur*, 160.

5. **proeesserant**: "had appeared" (a meaning not found before the period of Tiberius). — **Christianae potestatis documenta**: cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 4 (429, 7/8): *post tot ac tanta iam opera atque documenta Christianae religionis saeculo edita*. — **omnis . . . artificem**: similarly, 57, 2 (*spiritalia nequitiae* or *Satanan*, see the comm.) *multiformem luem mentis humanae, totius erroris artificem*; *test. anim.* 3 (138, 3/4): (*Satanan*) *malitiae angelum, totius erroris artificem, totius saeculi interpolatorem* (cf. Scholte's note). Since in Isidor. *Pelus. ep.* 1, 242 (P. G. 78, 329) we find αὐτὸς . . . τῆς πλάνης τεχνίτης (viz. the devil), it is possible that Tert. borrowed the expression from a Greek author. For the qualification of the Satan as *artifex mortis*, see Weyman, *Christl.-Lat. Poesie*, 30. As an adjunct. *artifex* is also used in *praescr.* 7, 19/20: *dialecticam . . . artificem struendi et destruendi*. For the use of subst. ending in *-tor* and *-trix* as adjunct., see Friebe, 52 *seqq.*; Svern., *Oros.*, 58/9; Hofmann, *Indogerm. Forsch.*, 43, 100; Wack., *Synt.*, 2, 54. — **avocatricem**: an ἄλ., like *avocator* in c. *Chr.* 5, 70. — **sola**: cf. 57, 2: *sed ratio fallaciae solos non fugit Christianos* (see comm.). — **traducit** = **coarguit**, ἐλέγχει. To understand the origin of this sense we must start from the meaning 'to place on view', 'to exhibit', > 'to turn into ridicule', which seems to occur for the first time in Prop. 2, 24, 7: *nec sic per totam infamis traduceret urbem* (Suet. *Tit.* 8; Sen. *nat. quaest.* 7, 31, 3; Iuven. 8, 17, 11, 31; Petron. 17, 9). From this meaning two new significations have sprung, which chiefly occur in Christian literature, viz. 'to bring to light' > 'to show up', 'to expose', and 'to accuse'. The former is found in 15, 4: *occulta cordis traducendo*; *pud.* 22 (272, 19): *traduceret cogitatus*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (323, 4); 3, 4 (381, 1); 4, 5 (432, 5); 4, 36 (545, 3); 5, 8 (600, 20); *fuga* 2, 2; 12, 4; *pud.* 8 (234, 6); *adv. Prax.* 1 (228, 15); in a similar context *Scap.* 2: *Daemones autem non tantum respuimus, verum et revincimus et cotidie traducimus et de hominibus expellimus*; for the latter meaning, see Rönsch, *It.*², 383 and *Sem.*, 3, 82; Ph. Thielmann, *A. L. L.* 8, 252; Waltz., *Ét.*, 322/3. — **idcirco** cannot refer to the preceding sentence, so that it must be regarded as a superfluous introduction to the words *secundum Pythii quoque daemonis suffragium*. A similar pleonasm is found in [Caes.] *bell. Hispan.* 39, 1: *saucius et intorto talo idcirco tardabatur* (see for this passage Heubner, 7; the places quoted in Thes. l. l. VII, 1: 173, 33/72 are of a different kind). — **sapientissimus Socrates**, etc.: the use of *quoque* shows that Tert. indeed regards Socrates as the *princeps philosophorum*, not solely on account of the words of the oracle ἀνδρῶν δὲ πάντων Σωκράτης σοφώτατος. — **Pythii . . . daemonis**: cf. *orat.* 17 (191, 3): *daemonium oraculi Pythii*; Salvian. *de gub. dei* 7, 101; [Lactant.] *de mort. persec.* 11; Chrysost. in 1 *ep. ad Corinth. homil.* 29, 1. For the view that the oracles are governed by demons, see comm. on 46, 12. This passage is similar to Min. Fel. 38, 5: *proinde Socrates scurra Atticus viderit nihil se scire confessus, testimonio licet fallacissimi daemonis gloriosus*. A different

estimation of the oracle given to Socrates is found in *apol.* 46, 5/6 (*ad nat.* 1, 4,7). — **socio suo**: 'his colleague', viz. the *daemonium* of Socrates. — **adflatui**, viz. in exorcisms; cf. *apol.* 23, 4/6 and, for further details, Dölger, *Exorz.*, 127. According to the Latin apologists, the δαίμωνιον of Socrates was an evil demon, more properly a δαίμων πάρεδρος: Min. Fel. 26, 9: *eos spiritus daemonas esse poetae sciunt, philosophi disserunt, Socrates novit, qui ad nutum et arbitrium a d-s i d e n t i s* (παρέδρου) *sibi daemonis vel declinabat negotia vel petebat* (copied by [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 6); Tert. *apol.* 22, 1: *sciunt daemonas philosophi, Socrate ipso ad daemonis arbitrium expectante. quidni? cum et ipsi daemonium a pueritia a d h a e s i s s e* dicatur, *dehortatorium plane a bono* (in the present passage the same idea is expressed in a different way by the words *pessimum revera paedagogum*); Lactant. *div. instit.* 2, 14, 9 (*epit.* 23, 2). Cf. also Chalcid. *comm.* 168 (Chalcidius, who was a Christian himself, was not seldom influenced by Christian authors): *quippe Socrati dicitur a pueris c o m e s d a e m o n r e r u m agendarum praeceptor fuisse*; from the present treatise cf. 39, 3. As to the terminology, cf. Rufin *hist. eccles.* 2, 14, 5: *utens adminiculo a d s i s t e n t i s s i b i e t a d h a e r e n t i s daemonicae virtutis quam πάρεδρον vocant*; for the δαίμονες πάρεδροι in general, see the *comm.* on 28,5. So recently as in Cyrano de Bergerac, *Le pedant joué* (quoted by Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 47), the magus says: "Je prestay à Socrate un Demon familier". The Greek apologists do not share the view of their Latin colleagues about the δαίμωνιον of Socrates, for they regard Socrates primarily as the antagonist of the demons (see Heinze, *Apbl.*, 396₂ and 407, and for Clem. Alex. and Orig., Harnack, *Socr.*, 14; for the estimation of his δαίμωνιον in general, cf. Willing, *De Socratis daemonio quae antiquis temporibus fuerint opiniones*, *Comment. philol. Jenens.* VIII, 2, 1909). — The argument of this paragraph may be summed up in the following way: "The view that Socrates was wisest of all men, was based on the testimony of a demon (i. e. Apollo); now Christianity has broken the power of the demons, hence through Christianity the wisdom of Socrates (and a *fortiori* pagan philosophy as a whole) has been neutralized". A similar idea is found in *apol.* 46, 5: *nomen hoc philosophorum daemonia non fugiunt*. In the next paragraph this exposition is continued by a detailed comparison between the wisdom of Socrates and the *sapientia Christiana*, which comparison is based on the formulation of the charge against Socrates (for an allusion to this charge in the Acts of the Apostles (17, 18), see Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 53/4).

6. **de schola caeli**: cf. *scorp.* 12 (172, 6): *ipsa Christi schola*; *ib.* 9 (162, 14); *pall.* 6, 2. The subst. *schola*, which is found from Cicero downwards, and, together with *secta* and *familia*, serves as a translation of αἵρεσις (see Kroll, *Stud. röm. Lit.*, 252/3), frequently occurs in the first two centuries of our era in the sense of 'school of jurists' (cf. e. g. Norden, *Apul. und das röm. Privatrecht*, 67₁); so it is possible that this word was familiar to Tert. from his former profession. — **deos**... **negare**: οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων; *apol.* 46, 5:

(Socrates) *qui aliquid de veritate sapiebat deos negans*; *ad nat.* 2, 2, 12. *saeculi*: for the development of the signification 'this <sinful> world', which transitional meaning is found in several passages from pagan literature, see especially Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 470 *seqq.* and Tidn., *Did.*, 141. — *nullum . . . praevaricetur*: this has been copied from *apol.* 46, 5: *idem et qui aliquid de veritate sapiebat deos negans, Aesculapio tamen gallinaceum prosecari iam in fine iubebat, credo ob honorem patris eius, quia Socratem Apollo sapientissimum omnium cecinit* (∞ *ad nat.* 2, 2, 12; also see *cor.* 10, 28/9). The ridiculing of this sacrifice (which occurs already in Lucian. *bis accus.* 5) is only found in the works of Latin apologists (e. g. Lactant. *div. instit.* 3, 20, 16; cf. also Prud. *Apoth.* 204/6), though Harnack (*Socr.*, 18) is wrong in contending that it is not even mentioned in Greek apologetic writings (see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 32₄; add Chrysostom. *in Rom. homil.* 3, 2). For further details, see Geffcken, *Socr.*, 43. — *praevaricetur*: Socrates is qualified as a *praevaricator*, because, though he denied the existence of the gods, he admitted their existence by his sacrifice to Aesculapius; in *apol.* 46, 5 (*ad nat.* 2, 2, 12) this thought is more clearly expressed. In the classical period *praevaricari* mostly means 'to accuse (or defend) in appearance only', 'to tamper in secret with the opposing party' (e. g. Cic. *de harusp. respons.* 20, 42; *pro Cluent.* 21, 58; Ulp. *dig.* 47, 15, 1), or '*vera crimina abscondere*' (see Marcian. *dig.* 48, 16, 1, 1); in the Itala it is used to translate παραβαίνειν (Rönsch, *It.*², 377). Here the original sense 'to tamper with the opposing party' is still perceptible; in other passages the verb mostly means 'to deceive'; cf. Koffmane, 56, Thierry, 180, Beck, 169, and the notes on 17, 9 and 25, 2. — *gallinaceus* is found as a subst. from Colum. and Plin. *n. h.* downwards (Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 1684, 52 *seqq.*). — *nec . . . daemonia*: ἑτέρα δὲ καὶνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων; of course the meaning of *daemonia* in this passage is totally different from the sense of δαιμόνια in the charge. — *depellens*: this verb seems to refer here to exorcisms (cf. *adflatui* in § 5); it is found nowhere else in this sense (the technical term for exorcizing is *excludere*, see comm. on 2, 5). — *nec adulescentiam* (*adol-B*; the same is found in 56,6, where A has *adol-*) *vitiants*: τοὺς νέους διαφθείρων. Here again the translation is but seemingly accurate because Tert. refers διαφθείρων to παιδεραστία, as is shown by *apol.* 46, 10: *ceterum si de pudicitia provocemus, lego partem sententiae Atticae in Socratem: corruptor adulescentium pronuntiatur. at Christianus sexum nec femineum mutat*. Perhaps Tert. here follows the example of the διατριβή, the same rebuke being directed against Socrates and Plato by Lucian. *conviv.* 39; *viar. auct.* 15 (see Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, 229); the same source may have been used in Sen. *de vita beata* 27, 5, where Socrates says: *mihi ipsi Alcibiadem et Phaedrum obiectate* (the treatise 'Aristippus on the dissipations of the ancients', for which see Kroll, *Stud. röm. Lit.*, 316/7, belongs to the same class of writings). The same charge was brought against Arcesilaus and Bion (see Hense in the preface to his edition of Teles, p. LII/LIII). Cf. also the malicious allusion in 54,2 to *Phaedr.* 249 A παιδεραστήσαντος μετὰ φιλοσοφίας (likewise,

Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 13, 20 = 709 C/711 B) and from Christian literature [Clem.], *homil.* 5, 18; Hier. *ad Isai.* 2, 7; Min. Fel. 38, 5: *quos* (sc. philosophos) *corruptores et adulteros novimus*; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 3, 6 (Epicureans and Stoics as propagators of ἀδελφοκοιτίαι and ἀρενοβασίαι); Orig. c. *Cels.* 7, 49; for Arnobius, see W. Kroll, *Rh. Mus.* 71 (1916), 334. — *urbis . . . orbis*: a play upon words frequently found from Cic. *Catil.* 1, 9; Nepos *Attic.* 20, 5; Ovid *ars* 1, 174 and *fast.* 2, 684 downwards (from Tert. cf. *apol.* 40, 3). See Otto, *Sprichw.*, 358/9 and Wölfflin, *A. L. L.* 1, 388; we may add Sen. *de tranq. anim.* 4, 4; Hier. *comm. in Ezech.*, *praef.*; *adv. Pelag.*, *praef.* 2; *adv. Vigilant.* 9; *Martyr. beati Pauli apostoli* 1 (*Act. apost. apocr.* I: 2, 2); see also Goetz-Schoell's note on Varro *l. l.* 5, 143. — *veritatis . . . perosioris*: this refers to the proverb *veritas odium parit* (Tert. *Andr.* 68), for which see Otto, *op. cit.*, 368; Weyman, *A. L. L.* 8, 411; Sonny, *ib.* 9, 79. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 7, 3. 14, 7. 46, 6. The passive meaning of *perosus* is not found before Tert. (also in *poen.* 5, 9, v. v. 16 (conjecture by Rhenanus), *adv. Marc.* 4, 33 (531, 21; a quotation from Holy Scripture), and *ad nat.* 1, 4, 5: *veritatem saeculo [o]perosissimam*; a different interpretation is given by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 78). For passages from other authors, see the *Addenda et corrigenda* in the *Index verborum*, p. 256 (we may add Avit. *carm.* 3, 30; Serv. *ad Verg. buc.* 6, 41; Aug. *de trin.* 13, 13, 17; Salvian. *ad eccles.* 3, 48). — *tanto . . . et perosioris, quanto plenioris*: in compound sentences Tert. frequently inserts a pleonastic *et*, but mostly in both parts, or only in the subordinate clause (e. g. 8, 1 *tam amica quam et aemula*); in the principal sentence such an insertion is also found in 28, 3; 53, 4; *mon.* 4; see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 77 and Eran., 25 (1927), 220/1; Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 27 and *Krit.*, 94; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 119, and more in general Löfst., *Per.*, 43; Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 450; Hofmann, *Synt.*, 661; Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.*, 2, 120; Wahlén, 122; Tidn., *de partic. copulat.*, 91 *seqq.*; Sjögren, *Symb. Danielsson*, 346; Svénn., *Pallad.*, 491 *seq.*; Linderbauer, 335 and 376; Petersson, *Justin.*, 58; Lögdberg, 27 *seqq.* — *per habitum iocunditatis*: *Phaedo* 117 C: καὶ μάλα εὐχερῶς καὶ εὐχόλως ἐξέπτεν. The genit. seems to be equivalent to an adjunct: 'in a pleasant mood', though we may also translate: 'under a show of pleasantness' (cf. § 2). At all events, the main stress lies on *iocunditatis*, the addition of *habitus* being primarily due to parallelism (∞ *per omne ingenium crudelitatis*; cf. the note on *materiae suggestu* in § 1). *iocunditas*, not *iuc-*, is written by Tert. in *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (461, 20; Isai. 65, 14) and 5, 4 (581, 2; Os. 2, 11). — *vivicomburio*: this subst. is only used by Tert. (also in 33, 6). For being burnt to death as a punishment for Christians, see Lietzmann's note on 1 Cor. 13, 3 (*Hdb. N. T.* 9, p. 65) and Bauer's note on Ignat. ad Rom. 5, 3 (*ib.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 250). — *ingenium* 'invention' (from Plin. *paneg.* 49, 7; Tac. *hist.* 3, 28, 1 downwards) occurs very frequently in Tert.'s works (with a genit. also *pud.* 22 (273, 13): *ingenia carnificii et genera poenarum*; *scorp.* 7 (159, 2/3): *o parricidii ingenium! o sceleris artificium!*; v. v. 1; *res.* 8 (37, 19); *ad mart.* 4; *exh. cast.* 9, 8; *c. Chr.* 7, 43; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 44; without a genit. more than 20 times); this passage may have been

copied by Hier. *ep.* 100, 9, 1: *victa sunt in eis omnia crudelitatis ingenia* (Cypr. *ad Demetr.* 12 (360, 14 H.): *ingeniosa crudelitas*). Cf. Svenn., *Pallad.*, 580. — *exhauriat* is here used in analogy of such expressions as *laborem*, *periculum*, *poenas exhaurire* (Verg. *Liv.*); of course the choice of the verb is primarily due to the wish to create a climax after *absorbeat*. — *tenebrosiore*, sc. *carcere Socratis*; similarly, *mart.* 2: *si enim recogitemus ipsum magis mundum carcerem esse . . . maiores tenebras* (sc. *quam carcer vester*) *habet mundus*. Cf. *pat.* 13 (21, 2): *illa* (sc. *caro in carcere*) *et in paupertate lucis*; *Liv.* 6, 17, 5; *Valerian. homil.* 16: *tenebrosis sedibus otiosa supplicia*; *Achelis*, 2, 246₄. — *inter . . . Phaedonas*: likewise, *Sen. de tranq. anim.* 7, 5: *inter Platonas et Xenophontas*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 17 (358, 27): *ante Lycurgos et Solonas omnes*; *pall.* 5, 4: *cum ad Epicuros et Zenonas ventum est*, etc. — *ad . . . diriget*: not “will direct this investigation in accordance with the rules laid down by God”, but “will interpret this, etc.”, for *dirigere* in Tert.’s works is often almost equivalent to *interpretari*, e. g. *adv. Herm.* 23 (151, 23 *seqq.*): *et ‘erat’* (*Gen.* 1, 2) *in hoc dirigit, quasi quae semper fuerit* (sc. *terra*); *adv. Marc.* 4, 11 (452, 5/6): *si in hoc dirigebat similitudinem* (almost = *si sim. ita interpretabatur*); *res.* 2 (26, 8) and 37 (79, 2); *adv. Marc.* 4, 38 (550, 18); 5, 12 (617, 23); *pud.* 9 (238, 26). In *adv. Marc.* 4, 12 (453, 13): *cetera de sabbato ita dirigo* the verb is completely synonymous to *interpretari*. Cf. *Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 1239, 65 *seqq.* (the earliest instance occurs in [Quint.] *declam.* 4, 15; for *adv. Prax.* 2, which is wrongly quoted under this heading, see the note on 25, 9). — *certa*: this conjecture by Hartel (*certe* B Gel) is certainly right, *certus* being frequently followed by an *accus. cum inf.* in Tert. (cf. *Thes.* I. L. III: 920, 24 *seqq.*). — *demonstratorem* is almost equivalent to *interpretem* (this meaning is found from *Colum.* 3, 10, 20 downwards). For the thoughts uttered at the end of this chapter, see the note on 2, 7, in which passage Tert. expresses his opinion about the limits of an admissible curiosity more fully. For *praestat per deum nescire*, cf. *praescr.* 14, 7/8: *Novissime ignorare melius est, ne quod non debeas noris, quia (qui Kroymann) quod debeas nosti*. For the use of *unde*, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 30/1.

2. The essential features of pagan philosophy.

“It is true that sometimes pagan philosophers discovered a partial truth — the power of Truth is proved by the very fact that it manifests itself everywhere <, even among philosophers> —. Such discoveries are partly due to chance, and partly to common sense, with which God has deigned to endow the soul (§ 1). It is this human reason alone on which philosophers rely and of which in their thirst for glory they make an excessive use for the purpose of demonstrating anything they like. In doing this they overawe their audience by eloquence rather than convincing it by sound arguments: without taking account of the properties of things, they subsume them to general or specific rules, do not leave any room for the omnipotence of God, and make their personal opinions appear as natural laws (§ 2).

Moreover, they appeal to pretendedly sacred books, the sacredness of which is due to the fact that in ancient times many authors were considered to be demigods or even gods, for instance *Mercurius Aegyptius*, Silenus, Hermotimus, Orpheus, Musaeus, and Pherecydes. Besides, they also happened to find various books that we Christians regard as apocryphal; for we are convinced that we must condemn whatever does not concord with the canon of Holy Scripture, for being only too familiar with the impostures of pseudoprophets and of fallen angels (§ 3). Finally, philosophers found books belonging to Holy Scripture, but whatever they found there, they made subservient to falsehood (§ 4).

So my task with regard to this subject is clear: I must detach all views I have in common with philosophers from their arguments, and, on the other hand, I must detach all the arguments I share with them from their conclusions. Whatever I discuss I shall trace back to Holy Scripture; nevertheless, I shall also quote utterances by philosophers as testimonies of Truth, because even evidence given by an adversary may be of value (§ 5). Though I know quite well how many things have been written by philosophers about the soul, I have nevertheless consulted medical science too, which is the sister of philosophy; that these two sciences frequently clash and on this very subject contend for the mastery, is immaterial to me. In this domain there is so much that is uncertain, that Heraclitus even gave up all hope ever to know anything about the soul (§ 6). A Christian, however, does not need much knowledge about this subject, firstly, because facts that are positively certain are never numerous, and secondly, because endless investigations are forbidden by St. Paul. Man is not allowed to find more than he learns from God; yet the very things he learns from God constitute perfect Truth (§ 7)".

Though the present chapter contains several ideas proper to Christian apologetics, it yet possesses a certain originality in both structure and detail. Tert. mentions five sources of pagan philosophy: pure chance, common sense, sacred books ascribed to famous θεόλογοι such as *Mercurius Aegyptius*, apocryphal books, and the Old Testament (he assumes that the last-mentioned authority was either falsified or wrongly applied by philosophers). Of these sources the fourth is mentioned nowhere else, and the first is only considered by Clement of Alexandria. Plagiarism from Holy Scripture is frequently mentioned in apologetic literature, but Tert.'s account of it stands by itself. The description of the methods of philosophy in § 2 and the value attached to the *testimonium ex aemulis* in § 5 betrays the former lawyer; the last paragraph of the chapter was copied from the treatise *De praescriptione haereticorum*. Hence a considerable part of this chapter is of Tert.'s own finding.

Besides this, several particulars are found which plainly recall the Sceptics, especially in § 6, which follows the discussion of the sources of pagan philosophy. In the first place the well-known quotation from Heraclitus may be mentioned, which (though not recorded by Sextus Empiricus) may derive from Aenesidemus. The stress laid

on the *operositas* of philosophers recalls the attacks by Sceptics from Timon downwards on the περιεργία and πολυπραγμοσύνη of the δογματικοί, and the *infinite quæstiones* which Tert. finds fault with in § 7 may refer to the definition of discussions on the soul as πολλή καὶ ἀνήνυτος μάχη (Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 2, 31). Finally, § 5 possibly contains a reminiscence of one of the Sceptic τρόποι, and the qualification of medical science as the 'sister of philosophy' (§ 6) points the same way (see the comm. on these passages).

The list of θεόλογοι in § 3 is partly based on a miracle-book (see comm. and Introduction, p. 47*); as for Tert.'s having read the *Corpus Hermeticum*, see Introduction, p. 47*.

So we arrive at the conclusion that in the present chapter Tert. combines thoughts that are all his own with ideas borrowed from Christian apologetics and data taken from Soranus, who frequently based himself on the Sceptics (Introduction, p. 30*). Probably these data were found by Tert. in the preface to Περὶ ψυχῆς (at any rate, the quotation from Heraclitus would fit in very well there), but he did not copy it in its entirety, the materials at his disposal being sufficient already; he only took from it whatever he considered to be useful.

1. **Plane** at the beginning of a sentence is frequently equivalent to *sane* ('indeed', 'to be sure') in Tert.'s works (from *de anim.* cf. 10, 9; 24, 5; 32, 1; 50, 3; 53, 2). — **iuxta nostra sensisse**: similarly, *frag. Fuld.* § 5: *inde quaedam nobiscum vel prope nos habetis*; cf. *proxime* in *res.* 1 (25, 18). With the sense of *secundum*, *iuxta* is found from Vitruv. 1, 1, 17 (or possibly Liv. 39, 9, 6) downwards; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 502/3; Parriger, 78/9; for Tert., cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 37. — **nostra** = *Christiana*, as in 20, 1: *Seneca saepe noster*; 2, 5; 4; 23, 3; 26, 1; *nostrī* = *Christiani* is found in 7, 1 and 56, 5. For *nos(ter)* referring to Montanists (e. g. 9, 4), see Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 356/7. — **testimonium . . . ipsius**: "<the circumstance that philosophers sometimes agree with us, and so are endowed with some part of truth, is not injurious to Truth; for> its <accidental> appearance (i. e. its coming to light everywhere irrespective of persons, and so in the works of pagan philosophers too) even (*etiam*) testifies in its favour". According to Thes. l. L. V, 2: 1019, 15, *eventus* in the present passage means 'fere i. q. adventum, actum'; the former interpretation only is right. The meaning 'occurrence' or 'appearance' is also found in 46, 2: *erit aliquis et veritatis* (= verorum somniorum) *eventus*; *res.* 21 (54, 12/3): *et merces autem et periculum in resurrectionis pendet eventu*; *ib.* 55 (115, 13); *adv. Marc.* 3, 6 (385, 22/3): *quod . . . materia* (Kroymann wrongly writes *ea materia*; cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 112) *caret, non admittit sapientiae eventum* ('does not admit of the occurrence of wisdom', i. e. 'with regard to this subject it is impossible to set our intellect going'). Sometimes the meaning 'eventuality', 'possibility' (e. g. *fuga* 5, 1) gives rise to the signification 'accidental occurrence', for instance in *ad nat.* 1, 16, 11: *plane ex aliqua disciplina severiores aut certo respectu eiusmodi eventum a libidine temperatis . . . ut non dispersio*

seminum et saltus ubique luxuriae nescientibus filios edat (in the same context *ib.* § 16 and *apol.* 9, 19); hence in *ad nat.* 1, 16, 9: *luxuriam inter errores et ventos* (A; *ut ventos* Oehl.) *fluctuantem*, it seems best to agree with Hartel in reading *et eventus* (*eventus* Borleffs). Cf. also *praescr.* 28, 9/10: *Nullus inter multos eventus unus (iste unus Kroym.) est exitus: variasse debuerat error doctrinae (doctrinam Kroym.) ecclesiarum*. In the passage under discussion too this additional meaning still obtains; moreover, in the next sentence Tert. mentions a *prosperus error*. The first word of the sentence is strongly emphasized as in the well-known phrase *semen est sanguis Christianorum* (*apol.* 50, 13), in which a totally unexpected idea in the same way forms the nominal predicate. — *ipsius* is almost equivalent to *eius* (however, it has more stress); for this use of *ipse* in general, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 480; Svenn., *Oros.*, 67; Tidn., *Did.*, 52. For Tert., cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 112/3. In the present passage, as in 53, 4, the choice of *ipse* is also due to the clausula (1 γ; 53, 4: 2 βγζ). — *portus*: the same metaphor is found in Clem. Alex. *paed.* 2, 2, 28, 3: τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀστοχῆσας λιμένος; Iren. 4 *praef.*; Aug. *de vita beata* 1, 5; Max. Tyr. *diss.* 30, 2, etc. — *natura . . . suggeruntur*: *spect.* 2 (2, 23/4): *quod ultro natura suggerit, deum esse universitatis conditorem*; *ep. de cast.* 9, 1 (p. 136 Casp.): *natura suggerente*. — *natura . . . de publico sensu*: for the alternation of an ablat. and *de*, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 5/9 (this variation becomes more obvious on account of the frequent occurrence of the ablat. *natura*; in *de anim.* it is found ten times). — *publico sensu*: the κοινὰ ἔννοια of the Stoics. For the significance of this idea in Tert.'s works, see comm. on ch. 41; Esser, 11/2. 18/9. 167₃; Rauch, 42; Schelowsky, 45; Heinze, *Apol.*, 470; Adam, *Kirch.*, 126; Lortz, *Vernunft*, 140 and *Tert.*, 1, 242; Scholte, I/XI. Tert. gives various names to this conception: *communes sensus* (*res.* 3 (28, 22. 29, 23); *ib.* 5 (31, 5); *adv. Marc.* 1, 16 = 311, 4/5), *communis omnium sensus* (*ad nat.* 2, 5, 1), *conscientia communis* (*iei.* 6 = 280, 3), *omnium conscientia* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 3 = 293, 20), *communis lex . . . in publico mundi* (*cor.* 6, 1/2); for more elaborate definitions, see Esser, 167₃. — *dotare*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 10 (303, 13/4): *animae . . . a primordio conscientia dei dos est*. It is not very probable that in this connection the original meaning of *dos* was still felt by Tert.; he regards baptism as the marriage of the soul to the Holy Spirit, on which occasion the flesh follows the soul as a *dotale mancipium* (41, 4), so that he can hardly have regarded common sense; which is also an attribute of pagans, as a dowry given by God. Hence *dos* means no more than 'gift' (cf. Löfst., *Arnob.*, 78) in *paen.* 2, 3; *scorp.* 6 (156, 23); *res.* 12 (40, 28); *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (326, 16); 4,1 (422, 25). In the sense of 'to endow' *dotare* occurs in *adv. Herm.* 29 (156, 26); for further particulars, see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 2056, 79 *seqq.* — *dignatus est*: cf. 47, 2 *dignatio dei*. — The idea that pagan philosophers frequently found some part of truth by chance very seldom occurs in the works of Christian apologists. The closest parallel to the present passage is found in Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 1, 10, 3: ἡ δογματικὴ πραγματεία τοῖς φιλοσόφοις πῇ μὲν ἀληθῆς κατὰ στοιχασμὸν ἐπιβαλλομένοις, πῇ δὲ πεπλανημένη

and *ib.* 1, 16, 80 (quoted in the note on § 3: *apocryphorum confessione*; in this passage the words ὡς μὲν τινες show that this view existed already before Clem. Alex.). On the other hand, the εὑρεσις described by Justin *apol.* 2, 10, 2 ("Ὅσα γὰρ καλῶς αἰεὶ ἐφθέγγαντο καὶ εὔρον οἱ φιλοσοφῆσαντες ἢ νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ λόγου μέρος δι' εὐρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας ἐστὶ πονηθέντα αὐτοῖς) is not due to chance, but to the σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου, which, according to this apologist, is present in the souls of philosophers (the στοχάζεσθαι frequently mentioned in medical literature (see Jaeger, *Diokles*, 39) is of a totally different kind, so that an influence of Soranus is out of the question in this passage). Much more common in apologetics is the idea that common sense is an important source of knowledge, above all of the knowledge of God; cf. the passages collected by Lortz and Scholte (however, we should not forget that the doctrine of Justin concerning the ἐνοῦσα ἐμφύτου τοῦ λόγου σπορά (*apol.* 2, 13, 5) is totally different from the Stoic conception of the κοινὰ ἔννοια, which in this literature is found for the first time in Athenag. *resurr.* 14. 24). Tatian. may have combated this idea, when he wrote (*orat.* 12 = 13, 31 *seqq.* Schwartz): ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῶν λεγόντων οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώττης οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰκότων <οὐδὲ ἀπ'> ἐννοίων συντάξεως τε σοφιστικῆς, θειοτέρας δὲ τινος ἐκφωνήσεως λόγοις καταχρωμένων. The κοινὰ ἔννοια are of paramount importance in the works of Clem. Alex. (e. g. *strom.* 1, 19, 94, 2; 7, 16, 59, 9; 8, 1, 2, 4; cf. also Witt, *Albinus*, 32); moreover, cf. Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 4; 3, 40; 4, 84; 8, 52; *de princ.* 4, 1, 1; Arnob. 2, 68; 4, 2; 5, 9; Euseb. *de laud. Constant.* 13; Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 13 (p. 203/4 Matth.).

2. *nacta*: "took possession of"; similarly, *adv. Marc.* 4, 38 (551, 2): *nacti . . . scripturae textum*; *res.* 19 (51, 10). — *inflavit*: philosophy over-estimated the importance of human reason by forgetting that it needs divine revelation to be complete. — *ad gloriam propriae artis*: see comm. on 1, 2. *propriae* is equivalent to *suae*, cf. 38, 6: *sua firmamenta et propriae condicionis alimenta*; for further details, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 473 and Indogerm. Forsch. 43, 121; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 127; Svenn., *Oros.*, 65 *seqq.* and *Pallad.*, 317₄; Friebe, 76/7; Linderbauer, 374 (for the similar use of ἴδιος in Greek, see Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 74). The inverse case is much more frequent in Tert.'s works; cf. Löfst., *Krit.*, 95/6 and Hoppe, *Synt.*, 103. Eventually, the promiscuous use of *suus* and *proprius* is due to juridical language, cf. Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 57 and Lebreton, *Ét. Cic.*, 134. — *prae studio eloquii*: this rebuke is fairly common in apologetic literature, e. g. *apol.* 47, 3: *homines (sc. philosophi) gloriae . . . et eloquentiae solius libidinosi*; Tat. *orat.* 40; Cypr. *ep.* 55, 24; Lactant. *div. instit.* 3, 20, 5. The use of *eloquium* instead of *eloquentia* is peculiar to poetry; the word is frequently used by Tert. (e. g. 6, 7; *paen.* 4, 5; *ad nat.* 1, 4, 4; 2, 4, 17; *apol.* 18, 6; 23, 1; 48, 1), whereas he seems to avoid *eloquentia* (*apol.* 47, 3; not in *ad nat.*, *bapt.*, *paen.*, *fug.*, *an.*). — *prae*: in affirmative sentences *prae* with causal meaning occurs in some passages in Plaut. (*Amph.* 1066; *Stich.* 466; *Truc.* 328), but not in the classical period; this use

becomes frequent from Apul. (Médan, 74) and Tert. (Hoppe, *Tertull.*, 19) downwards. For further details, see Stolz-Schmalz, *Synt.*⁴, 273 (Hofm., *Synt.*, 443 and 532/3 says nothing about it); Senn., *Pallad.*, 377; Chruzander, 81; Ph. Thielmann, A. L. L. 8, 555; Bonnet, 615; Ebert, 325. — *struere atque destruere*: borrowed from *praescr.* 7, 18/20: *miserum (Arte inserunt Kroym.) Aristotelen, qui illis dialecticam instituit, artificem struendi et destruendi*. *Struere* and its compounds are frequently used by Tert.; in a similar context this verb is found in *adv. Marc.* 3, 6 (383, 13): *argumentationem sibi struere*; *praescr.* 23, 4; *adv. Prax.* 8 (237, 24). For the use of *struo* instead of *instruo*, see comm. on 10, 3. — *dicendo . . . docendo*: cf. *apol.* 45, 3 (V): *atque adeo quid plenius, dicere 'Non occides', an docere 'Ne irascaris quidem'?*; see also Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1750, 66 *seqq.* — *persuadentis*: likewise, in the contemporary treatise *adv. Val.* 1 (178, 11/2): *veritas autem docendo persuadet, non suadendo docet*. — *Formas rebus imponit*: in no passage of his work did Tert. more clearly state the reason of his aversion from pagan philosophy: he is always primarily interested in concrete things, which according to him cannot be subsumed to general laws without losing part of their very nature. A similar statement is made in *fuga* 4, 1: *non sensus hominis praeiudicat statui rerum, sed status sensui* (more about this sentence in the comm. on ch. 17). For *forma* = 'law', 'general rule', see Löfst., *Krit.*, 23 and 111/2. — *privat*: Rigaltius gives the right interpretation: 'privas et proprias adsignat': some laws are given out by philosophy as general laws to hold good for many things (this must be the sense of *peraequare*, which is hence also used with a pregnant sense), others as special ones, which hold good for few things only. The editors of the Thes. l. L. kindly inform me that this remarkable use of *privare* is found nowhere else; a parallel occurs in 46, 3: *Telmessenses nulla somnia evacuant* (= vacua, vana putant); cf. also Prop. 4, 9, 55: (ara) *interdicta viris metuenda lege piatur* ('pura servatur' Rothstein); *ib.* 4, 11, 31: *altera maternos exaequat turba Libones* (i. e. 'ut aequos illis opponit'). Nevertheless, these passages are not quite similar, the usual sense of *privare* being 'to deprive', so that the meaning becomes totally different here; cf. for this 43, 7: *somnum . . . probatorem valetudinum = qui valetudines probat = probas reddit*. Such changes of the original meaning are fairly frequent from Apuleius downwards (see the list made by Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 93/104; for literature on this subject, *ib.* 96); from an earlier period isolated instances may be quoted, e. g. Tac. *ann.* 15, 49, 2 *ad simulatio = studium adaequandi* (Koestermann). In Tert.'s works such changes are frequently due to parallelism (see the instances collected by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 117/8). — *de . . . praeiudicat*: usually Tert. is a warm advocate of this method, cf. e. g. *res.* 19 (51, 7 *seqq.*): *ut . . . manifestiora quaeque praevalcant et de incertis certiora praescribant*; *ib.* 21 (54, 1/3); *apol.* 3, 2; *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (301, 27 *seqq.*): *si ita est, ecquid tibi videtur iusta ratione defendi, ut ad normam et formam et regulam certorum probentur incerta? . . . plane in quibus diversitas status invenitur, fortassean non provocentur incerta ad formam certorum, ut liberata a reliqua comparationis provocatione per diversitatem status*

principalis (cf. the nearly identical terminology in the passage under consideration). For the use of *praeiudicare* in Tert.'s works, cf. Beck, 87/8, for *provocare*, *ib.*, 88/9. — *quasi . . . omnia: quasi comparanda sit B, quasi comparanda Gel.* The conjecture by Ursinus is necessary; the omission of the former *omnia* must be due to haplography. Moreover, the clausula (2 γ δ) supports this reading. *Comparare* probably means here 'to put on a level' (cf. e. g. *apol.* 47, 2). — *licentiae = potestati* (a law term: Beck, 159_g; Heumann-Seckel s. v.; also *bapt.* 17, 5 and *res.* 11 = 39,23). — *fecit*: the change of the tense is due to the clausula; cf. Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 104; *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 80; Carlsson, 67/8. A similar idea is found in Tatian. *orat.* 27 ex: Τὸ γὰρ περὶ τοιαύτην ἀσχολεῖσθαι ζήτησιν νομοθετοῦντός ἐστιν ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ τὰ δόγματα. — *ferrem, . . . ipsa*: a similar ellipsis is found in *pall.* 4, 2: *feras, si in puero*. — *compos* is equivalent here to *consciis* (see comm. on 55, 2). — *consortio*: a law term again (Beck, 111/2; Schlossmann, 418).

3. For this enumeration of θεόλογοι ἄνδρες, see the preface to this chapter. — *divos* here has the meaning mentioned by Serv. *ad Verg. Aen.* 12, 139: *nos deos aeternos dicimus, divos vero qui ex hominibus fiunt* (cf. *ib.* 5, 45). For further particulars about this word, see W. Schwering, *Deus und divus*, *Indogerm. Forsch.*, 34 (1914/5), 1/44, especially 26. — *Mercurium Aegyptium*: see Introduction, p. 47*. — *cui . . . adsuevit*: on these words Scott, *Hermetica* IV (Oxford 1936), 3, n. 6, remarks: "This most likely means that Plato learnt more of his philosophy from Hermes than from any other teacher; though it would be possible to take the words as meaning that Plato followed the teaching of Hermes more closely than any other Greek philosopher did". The alternative is much more plausible; at all events, the note is due to 28,1: *Quis ille nunc vetus sermo apud memoriam Platonis de animarum reciproco discursu? . . . divinum Albinus existimat, Mercurii forsitan Aegyptii*. Both here and in the next part of the sentence (*ut Silenum . . . tradidit*) the irony is obvious. — *cui . . . adsuevit*: the connection of this verb with a dat. denoting a personal object is very rare; in Thes. l. L. II: 908, 57 *seqq.* only one instance is quoted, viz., Prop. 3, 4, 6: *assuescent Latio Partha tropaea Iovi*; in a different sense Curt. 6, 5, 23: *Bagoas . . . specie singulari spado atque in ipso flore pueritiae, cui et Dareus adsuetus fuerat et mox Alexander adsuevit*. — *Silenum . . . tradidit*: cf. *adv. Herm.* 25 (154, 3/5): *nisi si et Sileno illi apud Midam regem adseveranti de alio orbe credendum est auctore Theopompo*; *pall.* 2, 1: *viderit Anaximander, si plures* (sc. esse mundos) *putat, viderit, si quis uspiam alius, ad Meropas, ut Silenus penes aures Midae blattit, aptas sane grandioribus fabulis*. The story was related by Theopompus in the eighth book of his Φιλιππικά (Theon *progymn.* 2 = Theop. frag. 74b Grenfell-Hunt, frag. 74a Jacoby): διηγήσεως δὲ παραδείγματα ἂν εἴη κάλλιστα . . . καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ ἐν τῇ ὁγδόῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἢ τοῦ Σειληνοῦ; this book may be identical with the Περὶ θαυμασιῶν quoted by Servius in this connection (*ad Verg. ecl.* 6, 13. 26; frag. 73b Gr.-H., frag. 75b Jac.). For some other accounts, see frag. 73/4 Gr.-H., frag.

74/5 Jac. For the contents of the story, see Rohde, *Roman*, 204 seq. In the account given by [Plut.] *Consol. ad Apollon.* 27 (115 B seqq.), which, just as Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 48, 114, harks back to Aristotle, Silenus says: ὥς ἄρα μὴ γίνεσθαι μέν . . . ἄριστον πάντων, τὸ δὲ τεθνάναι τοῦ ζῆν ἔστι κρεῖττον. Theopompus probably borrowed this story from Aristotle, so the account given by him may have contained the same pessimistic doctrine (see the note by Jacoby). As was shown in the Introduction (p. 47*), Tert. probably took this note and those concerning Hermotimus and Pherecydes from one of the numerous books dealing with θαυμασία. — **Hermotimum . . . contulerunt**: see for this story the preface to ch. 44. The mention of Hermotimus in this context is eventually due to the fact that Aristotle regarded him as a predecessor of Anaxagoras (*metaphys.* 1, 3 = 984b 15/20: νοῦν δὴ τις εἰπὼν ἐνεῖναι, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ζώοις, καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸν αἴτιον τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῆς τάξεως πάσης οἶον νήφων ἐφάνη παρ' εἰκῇ λέγοντας τοὺς πρότερον. φανερώς μὲν οὖν Ἀναξαγόραν ἴσμεν ἀψάμενον τούτων τῶν λόγων, αἴτιαν δ' ἔχει πρότερον Ἑρμότιμος ὁ Κλαζομένιος εἰπεῖν, see the note by Ross, and Zeller 1⁶, 1267/9; cf. Sext. *Empir. adv. math.* 9, 7). It is highly probably that more about this analogy was said by Aristotle in his lost treatise *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*, where he discussed the possibility that the same thoughts occur repeatedly in the history of mankind, in support of which theory he quoted numerous examples, for instance Pherecydes-Plato (see Jaeger, *Aristoteles*, 130 seqq.). Theopompus, probably through the intermediary of Eudoxus (Jaeger, *op. cit.*, 136), borrowed many data from Aristotle's *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* for his work *Περὶ θαυμασίων*; so it may be assumed that in this way the story of Hermotimus was included in the numerous collections of θαυμασία existing in Tert.'s time (for the possibility that Tert. took the story from the dream-book of Hermippus, see Introduction, 47*). It stands to reason that there can be no question of special writings having been ascribed to Hermotimus (nor to Silenus; the note by Scott on the present passage is certainly wrong): Tert. only has in mind the accounts found in his source. The mention of the temple in this connection proves that Hermotimus was *divus* indeed. — **Orpheus and Musaeus** are frequently mentioned by the Stoics along with Homer and Hesiod as the great θεόλογοι (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 1077/8; for Judaic apologetics (Aristobulus), cf. Ueberweg-Praechter, 571). For the estimation of Orpheus in Christian literature, see K. Ziegler, *R. E.* XVIII, 1313/4, who, unfortunately, hardly mentions apologetics. Athenagoras, who concerning this subject is sure to have consulted some Stoic authority (see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 194) writes in *legat.* 17: φημὶ οὖν Ὀρφέα καὶ Ὀμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον εἶναι τοὺς καὶ γένη καὶ ὀνόματα δόντας τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγομένοις θεοῖς; *ib.* 18: Ὀρφείως δέ, ὃς καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν πρῶτος ἐξηῦρεν καὶ τὰς γενέσεις διεξῆλθεν καὶ ὅσα ἐκάστοις πέπρακται εἶπεν καὶ πεπίστευται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀληθέστερον θεολογεῖν. Cf. also Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 4, 24, 1: ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρὰ τούτων τῶν προφητῶν τὴν θεολογίαν δεδιδαγμένοι ποιηταὶ δι' ὑπονοίας ('allegorically') πολλὰ φιλοσοφοῦσι, τὸν Ὀρφέα λέγω, τὸν Λίνον, τὸν

Μουσαῖον, τὸν "Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον καὶ τοὺς ταύτῃ σοφοὺς; *ib.* 1, 14, 59, 1. Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* 1, 16) mentions Linus, Musaeus, Orpheus, Pherecydes, Zoroaster, and Pythagoras as σοφοί (of course he excludes Moses; cf. *ib.* 1, 18). From Plato downwards (*Resp.* 2, 364 E; *Protag.* 316 D; *apol.* 41 A; *Ion* 536 B) Orpheus and Musaeus are usually mentioned together (from Tert. cf. *apol.* 21, 29, from Christian apologetics Tatian *orat.* 39 and 41). Tert. seems not to have been familiar with the well-known identification of Musaeus with Moses, which was propagated for the first time by Numenius (cf. Geffcken, *Ausgang*, 36; for Artapanus, cf. Wendland, *Kultur*, 199; see also the end of the next note). — **Pherecydem**: at first sight it might be supposed that Pherecydes is mentioned in this connection on account of his being regarded as the founder of the doctrine of metempsychosis (*Suid.* s. v. Φ. = frag. A 2 Diels; from Christian apologetics cf. Tatian. *orat.* 3 and 25); this supposition is supported by the words *Pythagorae magistrum*, the more so, since in ch. 28, in which this doctrine is discussed, both Pherecydes and *Mercurius Aegyptius*, who is the first-mentioned in the present list, are referred to. We should, however, remember that in this passage Tert. intends to draw up a list of divine or semi-divine θεόλογοι, and that in two cases already the influence of miracle-books was stated. So it seems preferable in this context not to regard Pherecydes primarily as an *auctor de anima* (with regard to Silenus this is even impossible), but to refer to frag. A 1 Diels: τοῦτόν φησι Θεόπομπος πρῶτον περὶ φύσεως καὶ θεῶν γράψαι. πολλά δὲ καὶ θαυμάσια λέγεται περὶ αὐτοῦ (in the sequel Theopompus' *Περὶ θαυμασίων* is explicitly mentioned; cf. also frag. 5 and 6). As in *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* Aristotle included Orpheus in the σοφισταί of ancient times (Jaeger, *Arist.*, 130), and we have already seen that many data from this work found their way into miracle-books, it may perhaps be assumed that, with the exception of *Mercurius Aegyptius*, the entire list harks back to a work of this kind; since, however, Orpheus and Musaeus are frequently mentioned by Christian apologists, who certainly did not consult such books, it may just as well be supposed that with regard to these two θεόλογοι Tert. kept to the common tradition of apologetics. With regard to the estimation of Pherecydes at this time it is important to state that Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* 4, 97. 6, 42/3) mentions him besides Socrates, Plato, and Pythagoras as one of the 'great philosophers'; for Basilides, see Liechtenhan, 107. — **incursaverunt**: in the same sense this verb is found in *ad nat.* 2, 2, 5, where it governs a dat. To my knowledge, the meaning 'to come across' followed by an accus. is not found before Tert. — **apocryphorum confessione**: "on account of <our> confession that they are apocryphal". This curious formulation may be due to the clausula (1 γ); it is for this reason that frequently an ablat. ending in *-ione* is chosen (numerous examples may be found in H. Hagendahl, *La prose métrique d'Arnobé*). As far as I know, the view that pagan philosophy used to draw on apocryphal books, composed by 'pseudoprophets' and fallen angels, is found nowhere else; on the other hand, the view that philosophy originated from these angels,

is held by Hermias *Irris*. 1 (DDG 651, 3/6): Παῦλος ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος τοῖς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν Λακωνικὴν παροικοῦσι Κορινθίοις γράφων, ὡς ἀγαπητοί, ἀπεφώνητο λέγων· ἡ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου μωρία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (1 Cor. 3, 19), οὐκ ἀσκόπως εἰπὼν· δοκεῖ γάρ μοι τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰληφέναι ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀποστασίας. The same opinion may be referred to by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1, 16, 80 (52, 15 *seqq.* Staehl.): Ἡ μὲν οὖν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία, ὥς μὲν τινες, κατὰ περίπτωσιν ἐπήβολος τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀμῇ γέ πη, ἀμυδρῶς δὲ καὶ οὐ πάσης, γίνεται, ὥς δὲ ἄλλοι βούλονται, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν κίνησιν ἔχει (cf. the refutation of this view in *strom.* 6, 17, 159, 1/2 = 513, 19 *seqq.*)· ἐνιοὶ δὲ δυνάμεις τινὰς ὑποβεβηκυίας ἐμπνεῦσαι τὴν πᾶσαν φιλοσοφίαν ὑπειλήφασιν. This view may be due to a somewhat forced interpretation of Enoch 9, 6/7: ἃ ἐποίησεν Ἀζαήλ, ὃς ἐδίδαξεν πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐδήλωσεν τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ αἰῶνος, τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἃ ἐπιτηδεύουσι, <καὶ> ἐγνώσαν ἄνθρωποι, καὶ Σεμαζᾶς (here the text must be corrupt, the Ethiopian translation running: „how Samazel enlightened mankind”; Radermacher supposes: καὶ ἐγνώρισεν ἀνθρώποις Σεμαζᾶς). See A. Di Pauli, *Die Irrisio des Hermias* (Forsch. z. Christl. Lit.- u. Dogmengesch. VII, 2 (Paderborn 1907), 32/7. The partic. *pronatus* seems to be a ἁ. λ. The words *prophetica paratura* denote the entire Old Testament, not only the books of the prophets, Moses being regarded as the *primus propheta* (see comm. on 28, 1; cf. also ch. 4; *res.* 2 (26, 6); *praescr.* 20, 14/5). Already in Rom. 16, 26 γραφαὶ προφητικαὶ has this meaning (see the note by Lietzmann); for νόμος καὶ προφηταί, see Bauer's note on Ignat. *Smyrn.* 5, 1 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.* p. 268); cf. also Achelis, 1, 288/9. *paratura* (*Tp*) is frequently used by Tert. to refer to Holy Scripture, e. g. *iei.* 11 (289, 4); *apol.* 47, 9; *adv. Marc.* 4, 3 (427, 15); *mon.* 7. — *pseudoprophetarum*: cf. the notes by Windisch on 2 Petr. 2, 1 and 1 Joh. 4, 1. — *multo prius* has the function of an adjunct., see comm. on 1, 2: *anima tunc Socratis*. — *apostatarum*: see for this word Mohrm., *Aug.*, 81. Tert. refers to the fallen angels, who had intercourse with mortal women according to an interpretation of Gen. 6, 2, which translated the words כְּבָרֵי-הַאֱלֹהִים (υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ LXX, *fili*i Dei Vulg.) by ‘angels of God’ (ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ cod. Alexandr.). This story was widely spread by the book of Enoch (6 *seqq.*); it is found in Philo (e. g. *quod deus immut.* 1/2; *de Gigant.* 2) and Joseph. (*Antiq. Jud.* 1, 3/4), and is very common in the works of Christian apologists, e. g. Justin *apol.* 2, 4 (5), 3; Tatian. *orat.* 7; Athenag. *legat.* 24; Min. Fel. 26, 8; Clem. Alex. *paed.* 3, 2, 14, 2; *strom.* 3, 7; frag. 23; Iren. 4, 27, 2; [Cyp.] *de sing. cler.* 28 (204, 10/1 H.); Lactant. *div. instit.* 2, 14, 3; Commod. *instruct.* 1, 3; Sulpic. Sever. *chron.* 1, 2, 7. From Tert. (who in *cult. fem.* 1, 3, 1 emphatically defends the canonicity of the book of Enoch) cf. *v. v.* 7; *orat.* 22 (194, 17); *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1; *apol.* 22, 3. A reaction against this story sets in from the East: Origen (*quaest. in Heptateuch.* 1, 3) already questions it, just as Eusebius (*praepar. evang.* 5, 4); it is explicitly repudiated by Chrysostomus. A similar reaction is found in the western part of the Empire from the beginning of the fourth

century downwards: Hieronymus refers the book of Enoch to the apocryphal books, Augustine denies the reality of the story in *civ. dei* 15, 23, Filastrius mentions it as a form of heresy. Tert. in the present passage follows Enoch 8, in which chapter the fallen angels are said to have taught mankind all arts and crafts: 'Ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους Ἀζαήλ μαχαίρας ποιεῖν καὶ ὅπλα καὶ ἀσπίδας καὶ θώρακας, καὶ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μέταλλα καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν αὐτῶν καὶ ψέλια καὶ κόσμους καὶ στίβεις καὶ τὸ καλλιβλέφαρον καὶ παντοίους λίθους ἐκλεκτοὺς καὶ τὰ βαφικά . . . Σεμιαζᾶς ἐδίδαξεν ἐπαοιδὰς καὶ ῥιζοτομίας, Ἀρμωρῶς ἐπαοιδῶν λυτήριον, Ῥακιήλ ἀστρολογίας, Χωχιήλ τὰ σημειωτικά, Σαδιήλ ἀστεροσκοπίαν, Σεριήλ σελιναγωγίας. The same passage is referred to in *apol.* 35, 12: . . . *qui astrologos et haruspices et augures et magos de Caesarum capite consultant; quas artes ut ab angelis desertoribus proditas et a deo interdictas ne suis quidem causis adhibent christiani*; *idol.* 9 (38, 3 *seqq.*: astrology); *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1 (*metallorum opera, herbarum ingenia, incantationum vires, stellarum interpretatio, instrumentum . . . muliebris gloriae*), *ib.* 2, 10, 3; *Cypr. de hab. virg.* 14 (*mundus muliebris*); *Lactant. epit.* 23, 5 (astrology, divination, magic); [*Clem.*] *homil.* 8, 14; *Commod. instr.* 1, 3, 9/10; *Exc. ex Theodoto* 83; *Clem. Alex. strom.* 5, 10, 1/2 and *ecl. prophet.* 53, 4; *Iren. Epideixis* 18. For further particulars, see Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, 491 and ARW, 18 (1915), 159; H. Brewer, *Kommodian von Gaza*, 251/9; d'Alès, *Théol.*, 156/7; J. Turmel, *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.*, 3 (1898), 295 *seqq.* — *ingeniorum*: see comm. on 1, 6. — *omnem faciem saeculi* must mean 'the entire face of the world' (in the sense of *factura*, ποίημα, the subst. *facies* only occurs in *Aetna* 36: *facies* ('fiction') *haec altera vatum*; see Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 95). This formulation may be due to the analogy of *facies terrae*, an expression frequently found in Holy Scripture (Gen. 6, 7; Deuter. 6, 15 (quoted by Tert. in *scorp.* 2=148, 3); Ps. 1, 4; Luc. 21, 35; Act. apost. 17, 26; cf. *Thes.* I. VI: 50, 9/14 and 53, 67/71). Circumlocutions with *facies* are frequent in Christian literature, and should be regarded as Hebraisms (cf. *Thes.*, *loc. cit.* 53, 40 *seqq.*; Süss, *Stud. z. lat. Bibel*, 125 *seqq.*); as a parallel to *mundus* the words *saeculi facies* are found in [*Cypr.*] *de laude mart.* 22 (45, 2/3 H.). In the passage under discussion this expression may contain an allusion to Enoch 8, 1 (see comm. on *apostatarum* in this paragraph), according to which the fallen angels made mortal women familiar with στίβεις and καλλιβλέφαρον; this supposition is the more probable, because the whole treatise *De cultu feminarum* (cf. 1, 2, 1 and 2, 10, 3) is based on this very passage.

4. The theory that the Greeks borrowed their philosophy from the Old Testament, harks back to Judaic apologetics of the Hellenistic period (for Aristobulus, see Gercke, *R. E.* II, 918/20, for Philo, Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, 238 and All, *Gesch. der Logosidee*, 1, 188; from Josephus cf. especially *c. Apion.* 2, 168, 257). In the works of Christian apologists this doctrine is frequently found, mostly side by side with the view that pagans falsified whatever they found in Holy Scripture. The most notable passage referring to this doctrine occurs in Tatian.

orat. 40 (41, 4/10 Schwartz): πολλῇ γὰρ οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς σοφισταὶ κεχρημένοι περιεργία τὰ ὅσα παρὰ τῶν κατὰ Μωσέα καὶ τῶν ὁμοίως αὐτῷ φιλοσοφούντων ἐγνώσαν, παραχαράττειν ἐπειράθησαν, πρῶτον μὲν ἵνα τι λέγειν ἴδιον νομισθῶσιν, δεύτερον δὲ ὅπως τὰ ὅσα μὴ συνέεσαν διὰ τινος ἐπιπλάστου ῥητορολογίας παρακαλύπτοντες, ὡς μυθολογίαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν παραβραβεύσωσιν. Cf. also Justin *apol.* 1, 44, 8/9; 1, 54 (falsification of data from Holy Scripture by the demons); 1, 59, 1; 1, 60, 10 (for Justin, cf. also Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, 1⁵, 511, and Archambault's note on *dial.* 7); Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 1, 14; 2, 37 (for the different view of Athenagoras, see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 176 and Puech, *Apol. gr.*, 180); Min. Fel. 34, 5. A broader view is taken by Clem. Alex., e. g. *strom.* 1, 17, 87, 1: ταύτη δ' ἂν εἶεν 'κλεπταὶ καὶ λησταὶ' (Joh. 10, 8) οἱ παρ' Ἑλλησι φιλόσοφοι, πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας παρὰ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν προφητῶν μέρη τῆς ἀληθείας οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν λαβόντες, ἀλλ' ὡς ἴδια σφετερισάμενοι δόγματα, καὶ τὰ μὲν παραχαράξαντες, τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ περιεργίας ἀμαθῶς σοφισάμενοι, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐξευρόντες (moreover, see *paed.* 1, 1; 2, 1, 18, 1; 3, 11, 54, 2; *strom.* 1, 22/3; 2, 19, 100; 5, 1, 10; 7, 16, 96, 1/2). Afterwards this idea remains a very common one, e. g. [Justin] *cohort.* 14 *seqq.* and 19 *seqq.*; Cyrill. Alex. *c. Julian.* 6, 60/1 and 7, 36; Filastr. 129, 7; Firm. Mat. *err. prof. rel.* 21, 1; Lactant. *div. instit.* 3, 18 and 7, 7; Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 1, 12 *seqq.*; Ambros. *in Ps.* 118, 18, 4; Aug. *civ. dei* 8, 11 (the two last-mentioned authors specially refer to Plato). For literature on this subject, see Lietzmann's note on Rom. 2, 14/6 (*Hdb. N. T.* 8, p. 41); for Celsus, who in his turn accused the Christians of plagiarism from pagan philosophers (Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 9; 6, 11/9), cf. Lietzmann, *G. A. K.*, 2, 174. The most important discussion on this subject in Tert.'s works is found in *apol.* 47, 2 *seqq.*: *quis poetarum, quis sophistarum (= philosophorum, see comm. on 28, 2), qui non omnino de prophetarum fonte potaverit? . . . dum ad nostra conantur et homines gloriae, ut diximus, et eloquentiae solius libidinosi, si quid in sanctis obfunderunt digestis, pro instituto curiositatis ad propria opera verterunt, neque satis credentes divina esse, quo minus interpolarent, neque satis intellegentes, ut adhuc tunc subnubila, etiam ipsis Iudaeis obumbrata, quorum propria videbantur.* In the above passage, as was already rightly observed by Heinze (*Apol.*, 474), Tert. closely follows Tatianus (cf. Tat. (in the passage quoted above) ἵνα τι λέγειν ἴδιον νομισθῶσιν . . . Tert. *ad propria opera verterunt; ὅσα μὴ συνέεσαν . . . neque satis intellegentes; περιεργία . . . pro instituto curiositatis*). Cf. also *ad nat.* 2, 2, 5 and *frag. Fuld.* § 6: *gloriae homines si quid invenerant, ut proprium facerent, adulteraverunt;* it is for this reason that in *apol.* 46, 18 the philosopher is called *veritatis interpolator* and *furator*. Cf. also Lortz, 1, 118, 364 (especially note 31), and 377 *seqq.*; Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, 1⁵, 462/82. — *curiositatis*: this word was borrowed from *apol.* 47, 3 (*ad nat.* 2, 2, 5). Tert. means the περιεργία, with which the Sceptics from Timon downwards (cf. Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. gr. Skeptiz.*, 25) rebuked all 'dogmatic' philosophers. With reference to philosophy this word is also used by Tert. in *ad nat.* 2, 4, 19; *praescr.* 7, 38; 14, 2, 11; 43, 3; cf. also the

distinction between a *iusta ac necessaria* and a *enormis et otiosa curiositas* in 58, 9. In *idol.* 9 (38, 11) *cur.* refers to astrology, in *praescr.* 30, 6 and *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 23) to heretics (who, according to Tert., are the pupils of philosophers; cf. comm. on 3, 1); see also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 21. With concrete meaning *cur.* is found in 28, 4 and *apol.* 5, 7: *Hadrianus . . . omnium curiositatum explorator.* — *ad ipsos prophetas*: this again refers to the entire Old Testament, cf. comm. on § 3 *propheticae paraturae.* — *inter philosophos*: it is wrong to follow van der Vliet and Reifferscheid in inserting *et prophetas* (i. *proph. et philos.* Reiff.). If these words are added, the word *eorum* refers to both philosophers and prophets, whilst in the next sentence only *philosophi* is the subject of *commendant* and *subornant*; now such a change of the subject, which is generally uncommon in Tert.'s works, would be fairly surprising in a passage so carefully written. Moreover, the word *prophetis* in *consonantia prophetis* should be contrasted with *philosophos* only; hence, when adopting either of these conjectures, we must go further and after *siquidem* insert *philosophi*. It is, however, possible to leave the text as it is; the explanation is primarily dependent upon the interpretation of *inter philosophos*. Obviously the most natural solution is to regard the words *diversitas (societas) inter philosophos* as equivalent to *diversitas (societas) philosophorum inter se*. In this case the next words would mean that all philosophers adopted the same doctrine from Holy Scripture (this being their *societas*), and that the divergency of their several views is due to the fact that they worked up whatever they borrowed from 'the prophets' (*vera quaeque et consonantia prophetis*) in different ways (*aut aliunde commendant aut aliorum subornant*; this view is found in Justin *apol.* 1, 44, 9/10); thus the words *aliunde* and *aliorum* would refer to the well-known τόπος of the διαφωνία τῶν φιλοσόφων. In refutation of this interpretation it may be pointed out, firstly, that this τόπος is found in 3, 2, where it is apparently mentioned for the first time in the present treatise, secondly, that the words *aut aliunde commendant aut aliorum subornant* evidently correspond to the last words of the sentence: *aut adiuvari falsis aut patrocinari*: pagan philosophers 'allow truth to be supported by falsehood or to support it', i. e. they give false proofs for theses which are true, and inversely. This forces us to supply *atque prophetae* after *aliunde* and *aliorum*, and to regard the *diversitas* paraphrased by the above words as a divergency from 'the prophets'. Then *inter philosophos* does not mean 'among philosophers', but is equivalent to *apud philosophos*, as in 54, 2: *inter philosophos magnum habet privilegium impunitas*. After *diversitatis* the words *a prophetis* should be added, after *societatis*: *cum prophetis* (similarly, in 16, 2 after *delicti diversitas* something like *ab omnibus rebus* must be inserted; see also the note on 11, 2: *spiritus distinctionem*). The discussion is continued in § 5, in which passage the *communes* (sc. *nobiscum*) *sententiae* correspond to the *societas* mentioned in the present passage, and the *propriae sententiae* to the *diversitas*. So *diversitas eorum* is equivalent to *diversitas philosophorum a prophetis*, not to *diversitas philosophorum inter se*. — *vera quaeque*:

originally *quisque* is only joined on to the positive degree of an adjunct., if this adjunct. is equivalent to a superlat. (e. g. Lucr. 5, 1415: *pristina quaeque*), or if the author wants to avoid an accumulation of superlatives (e. g. Sallust. *orat. Macri* 19: *ignavi cuiusque tenuissimas spes*). A freer use of *quisque* after a posit. is found from Tac. and Suet. downwards; in the works of Apul. and Tert. it is extremely frequent. For further particulars, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 466; Wölfflin, *Kompar.*, 74 *seqq.*; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 17; Erikson, 42; Gabarrou, 163; Goclz., *Jér.*, 410; for Tert., see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 79/80 and Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 50. *commendant* is almost synonymous to *probant*, as in 37, 5 and *res.* 5 (32, 21). — *aliosum subornant*: 'make subservient to a different purpose'; as in the classical period, *subornare* mostly has an unfavourable sense in Tert.'s works (e. g. 44, 2; *ad nat.* 1, 7, 7; 2, 3, 1). *Efficere* followed by an *accus. c. inf.* (from Vitruv. 2, 6, 4 downwards) is specially frequent in the idiom of lawyers (Thes. I. L. V, 2: 174, 35/55). — *aut . . . patrocinari*: for the interpretation of this sentence, see the note on *inter philosophos* in this paragraph. The dat. *falsis* has the function of a *dat. auctoris* after *adiuvare*, whereas it denotes the object of *patrocinari*; for similar anomalies due to parallelism, see comm. on 50, 3. — *patrocinari*: this verb, which occurs from Ter. *Phormio* 939 downwards, is avoided by authors of the classical period, but is very frequent in juridical literature. For Tert., see Beck, 89; cf. also Koehler, 468.

5. *commiserit*: 'may bring us into conflict with' (the same meaning is found in *adv. Val.* 16 (196, 12) and *adv. Prax.* 30 = 287, 7). *ista* = *hac*, see comm. on 1, 1. — *communes*: see comm. on § 4: *inter philosophos*. — *argumentationibus*: this subst. has neutral sense here, as it also refers to Christians; mostly, however, Tert. uses it with an unfavourable meaning (from *de an.* cf. 6, 6; 15, 2; 24, 12; 51, 1), frequently with reference to heretics (especially in *adv. Herm.*, *Marc.*, *Prax.*). Afterwards *argumentum* and *-atio* become even synonymous to *fallacia*; cf. Thes. I. L. II: 540, 61/8 and for Victor Vit., Ferrère, 119. The same applies to *-ari*; cf. especially *adv. Herm.* 3 (129, 10): *argumentari tibi videor, Hermogenes?* (*argutari* Jun. Kroym.); *spect.* 4 (6, 1): *nequis argumentari nos putet* (*argutari* Jun. Meurs. Reiff.). For further details, see Oehler's note on *spect.* 4; Löfst., *Arnob.*, 65; Thes. I. L. II: 542, 22 *seqq.*; Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 9. — *vestiant*: a similar metaphor is found in *fuga* 1, 2: *igitur consultationi tuae ordinem quoque induimus*. This description to a certain extent recalls the sixth τρόπος τῆς τῶν αἰτιολογικῶν ἀνατροπῆς mentioned by Sext Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 183: ἔκτον καθ' ὃν πολλάκις τὰ μὲν φωρατὰ ταῖς ἰδίαις ὑποθέσει παραλαμβάνουσιν. — *exclusa*: La Cerda rightly observes: "quasi fascinare veritatem intuitus et acumen humanum, et rationibus ex industria nostra fugaretur velut excluduntur spiritus magicis veneficiis, aut quia praesumptio propriae ratiocinationis venenum sit ad perdendam veritatem". Truth is 'exorcized' by philosophy; *excludere* is the technical term for exorcizing, e. g. *idol.* 11 (42, 24): *si excluderit daemonium* (cf. Thes. I. L. V, 2: 1268, 72 *seqq.*; add Optat. Milev.

de schism. Donat. 4, 6). A similar use of this verb is found in 57, 5: (daemon) *nihil magis curans quam hoc ipsum excludere quod praedicamus*. In this context it is very plausible that *veneficia* means 'magic practices', a meaning found from Cic. *Brut.* 217 downwards: *veneficiis et cantionibus Titiniae* (cf. Ovid *her.* 6, 150; Plin. *n. h.* 18, 41. 25, 10; Petron. *sat.* 128, 2). However, the 'poisoning of Truth' is a not uncommon image, e. g. Hermas *vis.* 3, 9, 7; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 12; Cypr. *ep.* 73, 4: *gladii ac venena subvertendae veritatis*; from Tert. cf. *paen.* 7, 10: *haec . . . venena eius* (sc. diaboli) and in the present treatise 3, 2: *philosophatas doctrinas hominum miscentes aquas vino*; hence it is possible that *veneficia* has an ambiguous meaning here (cf. comm. on 28, 1 *divinus*). — **a philosophia**: *philosophia* is preceded by *a*, because Tert. regards it as identical with the sum total of philosophers (the same is found in 6, 8 and in *praescr.* 7, 6). — **veneficia in illam**: that all conjectures are superfluous, is evident from Priscillian. *tract.* 10 (96, 25 Schepss): *daemonum in se veneficia despiciens. sua* refers to the logical subject, as is frequently the case; from Tert. cf. e. g. *spect.* 28 (27, 1): *saginentur eiusmodi dulcibus convivae sui* = *saginet e. d. convivas suos*. — **utroque titulo** refers to *interdum . . . muniant* and *interdum . . . vestiant. titulus* in this passage is almost synonymous to *genus*, as in 58, 4: *ad utrumque titulum passionis*; cf. *adv. Marc.* 3, 17 (405, 15/6) and 5, 15 (627, 18). The frequent occurrence of this word in Tert.'s works is due to the influence of juridical Latin (cf. Beck, 90 and Waltzing's note on *apol.* 1, 4). Tert. mostly uses it in the sense of 'title', 'denomination' (hence also = 'book', see comm. on 3, 4) or 'cause', 'motive' (this sense occurs from Livy downwards). — **adversario**: in all other passages in which it appears as an adjunct., *adv.* governs a dat. (Thes. l. L. I: 842, 55 *seqq.*); for the use of a genit. instead of a dat., see comm. on 6, 3. — **sine . . . praeiudicii**: 'without a dangerous judgment given in anticipation' i. e. 'without to our prejudice giving a favourable verdict on philosophy in general'. For *praeiudicium*, see Beck, 87/8, for *laqueo*, cf. e. g. Cic. *pro Caecina* 83: *verbi laqueo capi*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 30 (525, 7). — **ad simplex testimonium**: viz., when plain truth is found in the works of pagan philosophers; even then it is a *testimonium veritatis* (this should of course be connected with § 1: *testimonium est etiam veritatis eventus ipsius*). — **aemulis**: 'from enemies'. In Tert.'s works *aemulus* nearly always (to my knowledge an exception is only found in 9, 6) has the meaning 'enemy' or 'hostile', which is found for the first time in Ovid *ars am.* 3, 360 (Thes. l. L. I: 979, 3 *seqq.*); cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 125. Sometimes *aemulus* denotes the devil, e. g. 20, 5; *paen.* 5, 7. 9; *apol.* 27, 4. For the idea expressed in the present passage, cf. *exh. cast.* 13, 1 *seqq.*: *Ad hanc meam cohortationem . . . accedunt etiam saecularia exempla, quae saepe nobis etiam in testimonium posita sunt, cum quid bonum et deo placitum ab extraneis quoque agnoscitur et testimonio honoratur*; in this passage, too, the fact that a partial truth is also found among pagans, is regarded as a testimony in favour of Truth in general. Cf. also Novat. *de trin.* 18: *firmum est genus probationis quod etiam ab adversario sumitur, ut veritas etiam ab ipsis inimicis veritatis probetur*; Iren. 4, 11, 5 (*Pass.*

Perpet. 21, 2/3). In a slightly different form this idea is found in *fuga* 2, 2: *nam et alias in quantum iustitiae iniquitas aemula est, in tantum materia est ad testimonium eius, cuius est aemula, ut sic iustitia in iniquitate perficiatur, quomodo virtus in infirmitate perficitur* (Thierry wrongly puts a comma after *materia est*): the *iniquitas* enables the *iustitia* to manifest its power. Cf. also *pat.* 1 (2, 10/2): *grande testimonium eius* (sc. *patientiae*) *est, cum etiam vanas saeculi disciplinas ad laudem et gloriam promovet*. — *si non aemulis prosit*: 'if it is useful to such as are not enemies' (Germ.: 'den Nichtfeinden'). *non* is closely connected with *aemulis*: this so-called ὁφ' ἑν is frequent in Tert.'s works; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 107; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 80; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 59/60; 2, 63; 3, 14. Several passages may be added, e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 16, 20: *vestris . . . non sacramentis*; *ib.* 2, 3, 4: *de non deo non deum* (sc. *nasci*); *v. v.* 7: *inter virgines et non virgines*; *mon.* 10: *non maritorum*. Cf. also Wack., *Synt.*, 2, 264 seqq. and Hofm., *Synt.*, 642.

6. *silva*: 'dense (or confused) quantity'; this metaphor, which is found for the first time in Plaut. *Mil.* 1154, is frequent in the works of Cic. (see Kroll's note on *Orator* 12), who sometimes adds *quasi*. In Tert.'s works the original meaning still obtains, e. g. *apol.* 4, 7: *squalentem silvam legum novis principalium rescriptorum et edictorum securibus runcatis et caeditis*; *pud.* 16 (254, 3); *ad nat.* 1, 12, 13; 2, 9, 2; *adv. Val.* 39 (212, 6); *cor.* 10, 40; for *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (459, 16), see comm. on 24, 11. Afterwards *silva* is frequently found in this sense; sometimes *quidam* or a similar expression is added, e. g. Pacian. *paraen.* 3: *donata, ut ita dixerim, silva delictorum*; Novat. *de trin.* 16; Aug. *solil.* 2, 14, 26. More detailed metaphors occur e. g. in Hier. *c. Rufin.* 3, 39: *de tanta librorum silva unum fruticem ac surculum proferre non potes*; Optat. Milev. *de schism. Donat.* 7, 1; Rufin. [Clem.] *recogn.* 1, 25; Oros. *adv. pagan.* 1, 12, 1; Aug. *confess.* 10, 35, 56; *Acta Archelai* 68, 2. Probably this use of *silva* was stimulated by the similar use of ὕλη in Greek (e. g. Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 10, 1: πολλήν . . . ὕλην βιβλίων; *ib.* 10, 13, 4; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 3, 26). The combination *silva materiae* may contain a play of words, as *silva* is frequently used in the sense of 'matter' (ὕλη, *materia*), especially by Chalcidius. — *palaestrae opinionum*: cf. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 1005 (Alex. Aphrodis. *de fato* 37): καὶ οὗτος δὴ ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς παλαιστράς ὧν δῆλον ὡς διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἂν ψευδὴς ὧν ἐλέγχεται. The meaning 'exercise in the schools of rhetors', which is frequent in Cic. (*de orat.* 1, 18, 81; *Brut.* 9, 37; *orat.* 56, 186), is impossible here. — *propagines quaestionum*: 'the propagation of questions'; cf. *scorp.* 9 (162, 28/9): *cum propagine nominis, cum traduce spiritus sancti*. — *implicationes expeditionum*: once more Tert. uses technical terms of rhetoric (for *implicatio*, see Cic. *de inv.* 2, 32, 100, for *expeditio*, *auct. ad Herenn.* 4, 29, 40) in a different sense, the meaning here being: 'intricate solutions'; cf. Aug. *de trin.* 12, 6, 7: *dum aliud solve intendunt, sic se implicant, ut expedire non possint*. For the oxymoron, cf. *apol.* 46, 7: *inimice . . . adfectant*; *res.* 13 (42, 9): *alius idem* (Thörn, *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 12/3). — *medicinam . . . philosophiae*: a very common idea from Democrit.

frag. B 31 Diels downwards: *ιατρικὴ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ Δ. σώματος νόσους ἀκίεσται, σοφίη δὲ ψυχὴν παθῶν ἀφαιρεῖται*; *ib.* C 6, 2; Philo Lariss. in Stob. 2, 7, 2 (II: 39, 24 *seqq.* Wachsm.; borrowed from Arius); Isidor. *Orig.* 4, 13, 5: *medicina secunda philosophia dicitur* (see for this passage Karpp, 36₈); Cic. *Tusc.* 4, 27, 58. For the Stoics, see Wendland, *Philos Schrift üb. d. Vorsehung*, 53₂ and *Kultur*², 82, for Philo, Kroll, *Hermes*, 342₂, for the Sceptics, Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. gr. Skeptiz.*, 126. This proverb may have been borrowed by Tert. from Soranus, who frequently quoted Democritus (see Introduction, p. 47*; in Cael. Aurel. *morb. chron.* 1, 4, 127 the *concupitus* is denoted as *parva epilepsia*, which harks back to Dem. B 32: *ξυνουσίη ἀποπληξίη συμικρή*, but in the form given by Clem. Alex. *paed.* 1, 6, 94 (214, 9 Staehlin): *μικρὰν ἐπιληψίαν*); Soranus may also have borrowed this from Arius. — **animae ratio**: 'the methodical discussion of the soul', which is almost equivalent to 'the doctrine of the soul'; cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 50 and Waltz., *comm.*, 34. For *ratio* as a pleonastic circumlocution, see Kroll's notes on Cic. *Brutus* 120. 306 and Nägelsbach, *Stilistik*⁸, 130; from the Greek cf. such passages as Plato *Phaedr.* 245 E: *ψυχῆς οὐσίαν τε καὶ λόγον*. — **viderit**: 'is immaterial to me'; cf. Oehler's note on *cor.* 13; Gerlo, 2, 37; Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 598. — **praestantiae**: according to Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 44), the meaning in this passage is 'capacity' ('quod philosophia et medicina praestare possint'). Though this signification should certainly be assumed in many of the passages quoted by Hartel, it seems preferable here to translate *praestantia* by 'priority' or 'superiority'. The same meaning, which also occurs in Cic. and Plin. *n. h.*, is found in *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 (296, 5): *de singularitate praestantiae suae* (Tert. is discussing the *bonus deus* assumed by Marcion); *ib.* 1, 5 (297, 3); *paen.* 4, 2. For further details, see Hartel, *loc. cit.*, and Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 107/8. — **ambitio**: with the meaning '*studium, cupiditas*', and followed by an objective genit., this word occurs twice in Tac., once in Sen. *controv.*; afterwards this use is only found in authors of the last period (Ennod., Oros.); cf. Thes. l. L. I: 1854, 56 *seqq.* — **necessitatem artificii**: cf. Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 5, 22, 43: *medicis qui haec propter artis suae necessitatem diligenter patefacta et dinumerata rimati sunt*. — **retractatus**: Tp. In Tert.'s works this subst. either means 'contemplation', 'examination' (e. g. *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (292, 7). 7 (298, 17); 5, 3 (576, 11); *mon.* 2, 9; *apol.* 11, 15; *an.* 22, 1. 46, 1; *praescr.* 7, 15) or 'difficulty', 'scruple', 'doubt', e. g. *res.* 2 (28, 7/8): *animae . . . salutem credo retractatu carere* (a different interpretation is given by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 138₁); *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (302, 15): *posteriora sunt in retractatu* ('are doubtful'); *bapt.* 12, 1; *adv. Prax.* 2 (229, 22) and 11 (245, 1); *spect.* 3 (4, 19; cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 81); *adv. Herm.* 33 (163, 1); *apol.* 4, 4: *sine ullo retractatu humaniore* ('sans aucune „considération" d'humanité' Waltz., *comm.*, 42). — **operositas**: *περιεργία* (cf. the quotation from Tatianus in the comm. on § 4); Quint. *instit.* 8, 3, 55: *est etiam quae περιεργία vocatur, supervacua, ut sic dixerim, operositas*. From Tert. cf. *orat.* 20 (192, 22; for the constitution of the text, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 77/8); *cult. fem.* 2, 7, 1 and 2, 10, 2. See comm. on § 4 *curiositatis*. — *Heraclitus ille*

tenebrosus: the same qualification of Heraclitus (which in Lat. literature is found from Cic. *fin.* 2, 5, 15 downwards) occurs in *adv. Marc.* 2, 28 (374, 27/8). From Christian literature cf. Tatian. *orat.* 3 (3, 17 Schwartz); Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 8, 50, 2; Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 1; c. *Rufin.* 1, 30; *Chron. ab Abrah.* 1517; Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 10, 14, 14 (504 C); Hippolyt. *refut.* 6, 9, 3; 9, 2; 9, 8, 1. 2; 9, 10, 10. 12. — *vastiores*: sc. *quam tenebrosa doctrina sua*. — *examinatores*: this word, which is also found in *apol.* 9, 15, does not seem to occur before Tert. — *taedio*: cf. Min. Fel. 5, 3: *taedio investigandae . . . veritatis*. — *terminos . . . ingrediendo*: B 45 Diels: ψυχῆς πείρατα ἴδων οὐκ ἂν ἐξεύροιο, πᾶσαν ἐπιπορευόμενος ὁδὸν · οὕτω βαθὺν λόγον ἔχει. Eventually, this quotation may hark back to the Sceptics (especially to Aenesidemus); so we may assume that it was borrowed by Tert. from Soranus. For the omission of *se*, which is very common in Tert., see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 52 *seqq.* and Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 7. — *ingrediendo*: the ablat. of the gerund replaces a present partic. (πορευόμενος). This use, isolated instances of which are found in archaic Latin (see Klotz's note on [Caes.] *bell. Hispan.* 12, 4), in Catull. (110, 7), and Cic. (Klotz, *loc. cit.*; Kühn-Stegm., 1, 752; a different interpretation is given by Hofm., *Synt.*, 599), is more frequently found in Sall., Ovid, and Prop. and becomes common from Livy and Vitruv. downwards. For further particulars, see Hofm., *loc. cit.*, and Indogerm. Forsch. 43 (1926), 88; Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 281. 290/1; Löfst., *Per.*, 159/60; Konjetzny, 345 (and nearly all monographs on the idiom of authors of the later period). For Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 56/7 and Waltz., *Ét.*, 397.

7. *amplius . . . inveniri licet*: a more detailed exposition of this view is given in *praescr.*, especially in 7, 38/42; 9, 9/11: *Unius . . . et certi instituti infinita inquisitio non potest esse. Quaerendum est, donec invenias, et credendum, ubi inveneris*; 14, 13/4: *Adversus regulam nihil scire omnia scire est*. Cf. Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 360/3; Rauch, 9. — *infinitas . . . quaestiones* is written by Tert. in imitation of 1 Tim. 1, 4: μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, to which passage he also alludes in *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (302, 5/6): *et ibitur in illas iam indeterminabiles quaestiones, quas apostolus non amat (interminatis Vulg. and Pelag.)*. Tert. commonly applies this text to heresy (*adv. Val.* 3 (180, 11/2); *praescr.* 33, 15/6: *Sed et cum genealogias indeterminatas nominat, Valentinus agnoscitur*), which is in accordance with its original meaning (see the note by Dibelius, *Hdb. N. T.* 13, p. 10); when connecting it with philosophy, he still emphasizes the relations existing between heretics and philosophers (*praescr.* 7, 23 *seqq.*; the passage under consideration immediately precedes a discussion of heresy). Pamelius and La Cerda propose to read *indefinitas*. It is true that in other quotations of this text by Tert. either *indeterminatas* (*praescr.* 33, 15; *adv. Val.* 3) or *indeterminabiles* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 9; *praescr.* 7, 23/4; here, however, A gives *interminabiles*) is found, but *infinitas* is also frequently found in this context (Iren. 1, *pr.*; Rufin.-Orig. *de princ.* 4, 3, 2; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sac.* 10 = 113, 16 Batiff.-Wilm.; Ambrosiast. *ad loc.*), so that there is no need to alter the text; moreover,

in a paraphrase (*praescr.* 9, 9) Tert. writes *infinita inquisitio*. The choice of this adject. may partly be due to a reminiscence of the *quaestiones infinitae*, which play so important a part in rhetoric (they correspond to the *θέσεις*, the *q. finitae* or *causae* being equivalent to *ὑποθέσεις*); cf. Quint. *instit.* 3, 5, 5: (*quaestiones*) *infinitae . . . quae remotis personis et temporibus et locis in utramque partem tractantur* (for further details, see Thes. 1. L. III: 689, 18 *seqq.*; Landgraf's note on Cic. *Rosc. Amerin.* 62). *prohibet* is equivalent to *vetat*, as in 40,2; see Waltzing, *Ét.*, 159. — *quod . . . totum est*: cf. *praescr.* 14, 13/4 (quoted above); *ad nat.* 2, 2, 4: *Deum omnium notitiam et veritatem adsecutus plenam atque perfectam sapientiam optinebit*. Moreover, see d'Alès, *Théol.*, 203/4; Guignebert, 427 *seqq.*; Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 360 *seqq.*, especially 364; Stier, 11/3; Klein, 351; Brandt, 151/2.

3. The philosophers as the 'patriarchs' of the heretics.

"If only there need not be heresies among us! Then we should not be forced, in discussing this subject, to concern ourselves with philosophers, who may be qualified as the patriarchs of the heretics. When St. Paul was at Athens, he already foresaw the danger threatening Truth on the part of philosophy; hence he uttered his famous warning (Coloss. 2, 8) (§ 1). The doctrines of these men, "by which water was added to the wine <of Truth>" (Isai. 1, 22), have created nothing but arbitrariness and confusion (§ 2). Surely it should be regarded as a defect of God's doctrine that it did not choose Greece for its starting-point, and that for the purposes of preaching it sent out a fisherman instead of a sophist! — So we are forced to attack the philosophers, firstly, because they are the teachers of the pagans, secondly, because they are the precursors of the heretics (§ 3). — One point of controversy was already brought to an issue <in the treatise *De Censu animae*,> in which I demonstrated that the soul sprang from the breath of God, not from matter; the next chapter will open the discussion of the remaining questions (§ 4)".

Only at the end of the preface (ch. 1/3) does Tert. mention the reason of his polemics against philosophy: the philosophers are the spiritual fathers of the heretics. This idea, which had already been propagated by Hippolytus and Irenaeus, here forms part of a more extensive argument, summed up in § 3: the philosophers are dangerous for being the teachers of both pagans (≈ ch. 1/2) and heretics (≈ ch. 3). The last paragraph of the chapter shows how closely the treatise *De censu animae* was connected with *De anima*.

1. *Atque utinam . . . emicarent*: 1 Cor. 11, 19 is frequently quoted by Tert.: *praescr.* 4, 16/8: *Et ideo haereses quoque oportebat esse, ut probabiles quique manifestarentur*; *res.* 63 (125, 4/5): *quia haereses esse oportuerat, u. p. q. m.*; parts of this text are quoted in *praescr.* 39, 3: *ut electi manifestentur*, *ib.* 30, 13/4, and *res.* 40 (82, 27); allusions to it are also found in *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (597, 19/21) and *adv. Val.* 5 (182, 15/7). The Itala (*cod. d, f, g*) has *oportet enim et haereses esse ut probati mani-*

festi fiant, the Vulgate *nam o. et h. e., ut et qui probati sunt, manifesti fiant in vobis*. So the use of *probabilis* and *emicare* in this passage may be Tert.'s own choice (see also von Soden, *Festgabe Jülicher*, 244, and Quispel, 113). For the meaning of *haeresis* in Tert.'s works, see H. Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache*, 120 *seqq.*, especially 122/3. The most important statement is found in *praescr.* 5, 1/7: *Porro, si dissensiones et scismata increpat* (sc. apostolus; 1 Cor. 11, 18), *quae sine dubio mala sunt, et in continenti haereses subiungit. Quod* (subiungit, quod Kroymann) *malis adiungat, malum utique profitetur, et quidem maius, cum ideo credidisse se dicat de scismatibus et dissensionibus, quia sciret etiam haereses oportere esse. Ostendit enim gravioris* (in gravioris Kroymann) *malis conspectu de levioribus se facile credidisse*. According to Janssen (*op. cit.*, 122), Tert. distinguishes the two notions *scisma* and *haeresis* more nicely than St. Paul may have done; however, this assertion cannot be right, for Tert., like St. Paul (Lietzmann *ad loc.*: "αἱρέσεις sind Ergebnisse der σχίσματα"), only points out that *haeresis* is worse than *scisma*. Cf. also Schlier, art. 'αἵρεσις', Kittel 1, 180/3; Mohrmann, *Aug.*, 116 and 150/1; H. Pétré, *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 15 (1937), 316/25; Sainio, 48/9. — *Nihil . . . experiremur*: probably it is to this passage that Tert. refers in the contemporary treatise *de resurr.* (5 = 31, 10/1): *ita nos rhetoricari quoque provocant haeretici, sicut etiam philosophari*. — *philosophis . . . haeticorum*: similarly, *adv. Herm.* 8 (135, 14/5): *haeticorum patriarchae, philosophi* (Hier. *ep.* 133, 2, 1: *pulchre quidam nostrorum ait: philosophi, patriarchae haeticorum*). This idea is frequently found in Tert.'s works: *praescr.* 7, 6/7: *ipsae denique haereses a philosophia subornantur* (see the entire chapter); *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 3/4); *ib.* 5, 19 (645, 9/10); *apol.* 47, 9; *anim.* 18, 3/4 (Plato as the *auctor* of the Valentinians); 18, 12; 23, 5/6. In the same way, Epicure is regarded by Tert. as the *patriarcha* of Marcion (see Quispel, 27/8 and 92). A monograph was devoted to this subject by Ern. Sal. Cyprianus, *Diatribae, qua expenditur illud Tertulliani: haeticorum patriarchae philosophi* (Helmstedt 1699). This idea is a very common one in Christian apologetics; it lies at the root of the structure of Hippolytus' *Refutatio* (see the preface, *DDG* 554, 24/30 and 41/3), and is especially frequent in Iren. (e. g. 2, 18, 2) and Hier. (*ep.* 133, 1, 2; in *Naum* 3, 16 *seqq.*, etc.). — *siquidem*: the causal clause contains the proof for the assertion that the philosophers are the patriarchs of the heretics. — *iam tunc*: "already in his time", viz. when heresies were not yet in existence. — *concussio*: see the note on 1, 2; to this passage cf. *fuga* 2, 4: *concussionem fidei* (sc. a diabolo) and *adv. Prax.* 1 (227, 3/4). Tert. regards the words κενῆς ἀπάτης in Coloss. 2, 8 (Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) as a paraphrase of the preceding τῆς φιλοσοφίας. The same is found in *adv. Marc.* 5, 19 (645, 3/4): *cum monet cavendum a subtililoquentia et philosophia, ut inani seductione* (for the erroneous interpretation of this passage by Harnack, *Marcion*, 51, who assumed that Marcion had replaced καὶ by ὥς, see Quispel, 92). — *providebatur*: Harris' conjecture *praevidebatur* is superfluous, *providere* often meaning 'to

foresee' in classical Latin, e. g. Caes. *bell. Gall.* 7, 30: *plus . . . animo providere et praesentire existimabatur*; Cic. *Vat.* 4; from Tert. cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 1 (569, 26/7): *ex tribu enim Benjamin oriturum Paulum providebat*; *ib.* 2, 26 (372, 4); *ad ux.* 2, 3: *vulnera . . . fidei ab apostolo provisā* ("praevisa Vaticani tres" Oehl.). For further particulars about the use of *pro* instead of *prae* in compound verbs, see Svenn., *Pallad.*, 379, *Oribas.*, 110, and my note on [Cyp.] *carm. de resurr. mort.* 200. — **linguatam**: Tp, and a very rare word (Vulg. *Sirac.* 8, 4. 25, 27; Gloss. IV: 25, 5; V: 592, 57 (IV: 488,8); Aug. *in Ps.* 99, 13; *op. imperf. c. Julian.* 3, 52. 4, 73; *Anthol. Lat.* 114, 3; with a different meaning ('formam linguae habens') [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 20 (209, 6 Batiff.-Wilm.); [Apul.] *de herb.* 124; the diminutive *linguatulus* is found in *ad nat.* 1, 8, 8). Tert. refers to Act. apost. 17, 21: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἠὲ καίρου ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκοῦειν καινότερον. Cf. also 20, 3; Sen. *ep.* 94, 62: (Alexander) *qui, quod cuique optimum est, eripit, Lacedaemona servire iubet, Athenas tacere*; Sidon. *Apollin. ep.* 8, 6: *Athenis loquacior*; Pacian. *ep.* 2, 4; Arator 2, 443/4 and 455/6; Thes. l. L. II: 1028, 34/74. — **sapientiae . . . caupones**: like the words *miscentes aquas vino* (§ 2; cf. Petron. 39, 12: *in aquario* (nascuntur) *copones et cucurbitae*), this refers to Isai. 1, 22 in the form given by the LXX. The interpretation of this text in early Christianity was discussed by T. Kleberg in his article "Weinfälschung — ein stilistisches Klischee bei den Kirchenvätern" (*Eran.* 38 (1940), 47/54). The most important passages may be mentioned here. The original text only says: "your wine has been diluted", whereas the LXX gives: οἱ κάπηλοι σου μίσγουσιν τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι (Symmachus: ὁ οἶνος μεμιγμένος ὕδατι; Aquila: συμποσιασμός σου περιτετμημένος ὕδατι; Theodotion: ὁ οἶνος περιηρημένος ὕδατι). The text of the LXX is followed by Gregor. *Theol. orat.* 2, 46 (P. G. 35, 453 B / C): οὐ γὰρ ἔσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύειν δυνάμενοι τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἀναμιγνύναι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι; Isidor. *Pelus. ep.* 1, 169 (P. G. 78, 293 B / C) and 3, 125 (825 D); Procop. *Gaz., comm. in Isai.* 5 (P. G. 87: 2, 1921 D); Ambros. *in Ps.* 118 *serm.* 11, 20 (P. L. 15, 1428 A): *sed hi sunt qui miscent aquam vino tamquam caupones pessimi, adulterantes sermonem dei*; Hier. *in Vigilant.* 1; *in Isai.* 1, 22 he translates *caupones tui miscent vinum aqua* and adds: *pro quo Symmachus transtulit: 'vinum tuum mixtum est aqua'* (this translation is also found in the Vulgate). It is possible that Kleberg is right in supposing that Tert., Ambros., and Hier. have made use of an old Latin translation of Isaiah, though it is equally possible that Tert. and Hier. themselves translated the text of the LXX. Several passages may be added to Kleberg's collection, e. g. Iren. *lat.* 4, 22, 1 (of course in the original text the LXX was quoted); Rufin.-Gregor. *Nazianz. orat.* 1, 46, 1; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 5 (51, 1/5 Batiff.-Wilm.); cf. also *Didasc. apost.* 18. Many parallels may be quoted from pagan literature, especially Lucian. *Hermotim.* 58: ὥστε ἔγωγε οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν καθ' ὃ τι σοι ὅμοιος φιλοσοφία καὶ οἶνος, εἰ μὴ ἄρα κατὰ τοῦτο μόνον, ὅτι καὶ οἱ φιλόσοφοι ἀποδίδονται τὰ μαθήματα ὥσπερ οἱ κάπηλοι, κερασάμενοι γε οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ δολώσαντες καὶ κακομετροῦντες

(throughout this treatise we find arguments borrowed from the Sceptics (see e. g. Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skeptiz.*, 266₂), so it is quite possible that this statement comes from the same source). The comparison of sophists or philosophers to κάπηλοι in general, without special reference to the quality of the wine they sell, is found much earlier, e. g. Plato *Protag.* 313 D: οἱ τὰ μαθήματα περιάγοντες κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ πωλοῦντες καὶ καπηλεύοντες (*Soph.* 223 D *seqq.*; *Polit.* 525 C). It is particularly frequent in popular philosophy; cf. the statement by Bion (Diog. Lăert. 4, 49): πυροὺς ἐκόμισα καὶ κριθᾶς πιπράσκω; Philo *de vita Mosis* 2, 212; *de Gigant.* 39; *de congress.* 53; Albin. *Proleg.* 5 (p. 201, 1/3 Herm.). *St. V. F.* 3, frag. 686 = Arius *ap. Stob. eclog.* 2, 7 (II: 110, 4/5 Wachsm.); Max. Tyr. *diss.* 27, 8; Tatian. *orat.* 1 (2, 14/5 Schwartz); for other passages, see Wetstein's note on 2 Cor. 2, 17 (οὐ γὰρ ἔσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ). The same metaphor is used by Kant, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (ed. by the Acad. in Berlin, IV, 388). — **prae-** **monitorium** . . **edictum**: viz. Coloss. 2, 8. The adjct. is a ἄλ. (*praemonitio*, which occurs in *pat.* 5 (7, 21) and *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (339, 8), is Tp). For the *peremptorium edictum* mentioned in *pud.* 1 (220, 3), see Dölger, A Ch 5 (1936), 264/5 and Beck, 128₃.

2. **Proinde enim et animae ratio**, sc. *concussa est* (this verb should be supplied from the preceding *concussio*, as was rightly pointed out by Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 50). In 16, 2 a similar elliptical sentence is introduced by *proinde*. — **philosophatas**: this form is mostly used as an impersonal participle (from Plaut. *Pseudol.* 687 downwards: *iam satis est philosophatum*; from Tert. cf. *pall.* 4, 7); as an adjct. it only occurs in this passage and in Aug. *de ordine* 1, 11, 31: *sutores philosophatos*, where it has active meaning. A parallel is furnished by Hippolyt. *refut. prooem.* (D D G 554, 29): ἐκ δογματῶν φιλοσοφουμένων (also with reproving sense) and 2 Petr. 1, 16: σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις. The meaning is well rendered by the Germ. term 'verphilosophiert'. — **miscentes** instead of *miscentium*, probably in the first place on account of the clausula (1 β δ); however, Tert. has a partiality for personifications (see the note on 14, 2). The plural *aquas* (LXX ὕδατι) is not to be regarded as a 'Christianism' (for which see Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 57), but either as a poetical plural (cf. von Geisau, *Apul. synt.*, 15/6; Bednara, 535/6) or as a designation of a large quantity (Svenn., *Pallad.*, 158). — The following enumeration may hark back to the Sceptics, who used to make lists of this kind for the purpose of showing the διαφωνία τῶν δογματικῶν (e. g. Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 151). — **immortalem negant animam**: obviously this refers to Epicurus (cf. ch. 42 and *testim. anim.* 1); the heretics influenced by him may be the Sadduceans (*res.* 2 = 26, 5/7). — **plus . . . affirmant**: like Plato (24, 1/2) and the Carpocratians (23, 2). — **dispositione**: = *statu, condicione*; this meaning is found for the first time in Tert. (*Thes. l. L. V.*, 1: 1435, 42 *seqq.*). — **Platonis honor**: like most of the apologists (see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 290), Tert. is very inconsistent in his estimation of Plato, so that beside many laudatory judgments, such as

occur in 23, 5: *doleo bona fide Platonem omnium haereticorum condimentarium factum*, 48, 2: *etsi Plato est, qui ea aestimavit, ad nat.* 2, 3, 4: *Platonis humanitas* (∞ *Epicuri duritia*), we find such ignoble remarks as 55, 4 *cum puerariis Platonis*. For the meaning of *honor* found here, cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 9/10): *et honorem et decorem*; *res.* 12 (40, 25): *funestatur mundi honor*; *v. v.* 7 *ex.* — **vigor**: Pamelius' conjecture *rigor* is supported by *Sen. consol. ad Helv.* 12, 4: *Zenoni a quo coepit Stoicorum rigida ac virilis sapientia*; however, the occurrence of *virilis* in the same sentence shows that it is possible to retain the original reading. In a later period these two words are sometimes interchanged; cf. Löfst., *Beitr.*, 99/100, to which we may add *ep. de mal. doctor.* 10, 1 (p. 82 Casp.); *Caes. Arelat. serm.* 214 (215), 1 Morin: *mirabilem in contentu mundi rigorem*; [Cypr.] *de sing. cler.* 39 (215, 1H.): *murus rigoris*; *Amm. Marc.* 16, 12, 18: *nec de rigore animorum quicquam remittentibus* (cf., however, to this passage *Tac. ann.* 6, 50, 1) and 21, 7, 1; [Cypr.] *de XII abus. saec.* 6 (161, 5/6 H.): *rigore suae firmitatis*; *ib.* (160, 14). — **Aristotelis tenor**: this either refers to the great extent of his writings or to the consistency of his arguments; the latter interpretation is more probable, both on account of the context (cf. *Empedoclis furor*) and of the fact that in juridical literature *tenor legis* or *sententiae* is often found with a somewhat similar meaning (e. g. *Hermog. Dig.* 42, 1, 46: *actorum verba emendare tenore* ('coherence') *sententiae perseverante*). For Tert.'s estimation of Aristotle (which is of no value, as he knew practically nothing about him), see the note on 46, 10 and my article 'Aristoteles', *RAC* 1, 658. The meaning 'force' or 'power', which is fairly often found in the later period (cf. e. g. *Watson*, 275, and *Mossberg*, 95), is impossible here. — **Epicuri stupor**: according to Iunius, *stupor* refers to τὸ ἀνελγῆτον; however, Tert.'s judgment is more unfavourable, for he regards Epicurus as the 'patriarch' of Marcion on account of his *stupens deus* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 18); 2, 16 (356, 15); 4, 15 (463, 26/8); cf. also 42, 1 (*vulgari satis opinione*) and *ad nat.* 2, 3, 4: *Epicuri duritia* ('obtuseness'). This qualification of Epicurus is found throughout patristic literature, e. g. *Lact. div. inst.* 3, 17, 23: *Democritus . . . hereditatem stultitiae reliquit Epicuro*; *Filastr.* 5, 2. — **Heracliti maeror**: Theophrastus already described Heraclitus as a μισανθρωπήσας (*Diog. Laërt.* 9, 3); afterwards he was contrasted as the 'weeping philosopher' with the 'laughing Democritus', e. g. *Sotion Περὶ ὀργῆς β'* in *Stob. flor.* (III) 20, 53: τοῖς δὲ σοφοῖς ἀντὶ ὀργῆς Ἡρακλείτω μὲν δάκρυα, Δημοκρίτῳ δὲ γέλως ἐπήρει; *Lucian. vit. auct.* 14; *de sacrif.* 15; *de mort. Peregr.* 7; *Hippolyt. refut.* 1, 4, 1; 1, 13, 4; *Sen. de ira* 2, 10, 5; *tranq. anim.* 15, 2; *Hermias irrisio* 13 (*D D G* 654, 17/9); *Sedul. carm.* 1, 332; *Tzetz.* 2, 722; see also *Diels, D G*, 256. — **Empedoclis furor**: see comm. on 32, 1/2; *Cic. Acad.* 2, 5, 14. To the entire passage may be compared *apol.* 47, 8: *sic et de animae statu, quum alii divinam et aeternam, alii dissolubilem contendunt; ut quis sensit, ita et intulit aut reformavit*, and *Arnob.* 2, 57.

3. *ex Iudaea*: Tert. may be thinking of *Isai.* 2, 3: *quia de Sion*

exibit lex, etc. — *piscatores . . . emittens*: this sentence was imitated by Hier. *ep.* 12, 2: *contra sophistas quoque saeculi et sapientes mundi Petrus et Iacobus piscator mittitur*. This passage proves Kellner to be wrong in supposing that by *sophista* Tert. means St. Paul (his error has sprung from the fact that he regarded *citius* as equivalent to *prius*, whereas in this passage it means *facilius*, *potius*). The antithesis found in this sentence occurs throughout patristic literature, e. g. Hier. *homil. in Ioh.* 1, 1 *seqq.* (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 388, 32/3): *piscator noster invenit, quod philosophus non invenit*; *tract. de Ps.* 143 (*ib.* 286, 8/9): *nolumus eloquentiam Platoniam, sed volumus simplicitatem apostolicam piscatorum*; *ib. de Ps.* 81 (79, 30 *seqq.*); *comm. in ep. ad Galat., praef.*; *adv. Lucif.* 14; *ep.* 53, 4, 1/2; Ambrosiast. *in 1 Cor.* 1, 17 and 4, 1; Aug. *civ. dei* 22,5; *in Ps.* 36 *enarr., serm.* 2, 14; *de agon. Christ.* 11, 12; Pelag. *ad 1 Cor.* 1, 19; Euseb. *Theophanie* p. 170, 21 *seqq.* Gressmann, etc. The Christians are mocked by Celsus (Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 62) and Julian (*ep.* 79 = 606, 19/21 Hertlein) as 'the theologizing fishermen'. — *citius* with the meaning of *facilius*, *potius*, which occurs for the first time in Cic. *invent.* 1, 6, 8, is frequently found in Tert. (*Thes.* 1. L. III: 1212, 15 *seqq.*). — *sophista* is used contemptuously instead of *philosophus* (see the note on 28, 2). — *praeconium*: for the qualification of St. Paul as *κῆρυξ*, see Dibelius' note on 1 Tim. 2, 7 (*Hdb. N. T.* 13, p. 27) and Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 5, 6 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 52); cf. also Friedrich, art. *κῆρυξ* and *κηρύσσειν*, *Kittel* 3, 694/5 and 714/6; v. Dobschütz, *T. U.* 11 (1894), 16 *seq.* — *de nidoribus*: *de* replaces an instrumental ablative here (*Thes.* 1. L. V: 62, 18 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 437/8 and 526/7; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 34; Rönisch, *It.*², 392 *seqq.*; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 110/2; Svernn., *Oros.*, 32; Löfst., *Per.*, 104; Elg, 4). — *enubilanda*: this verb (which is also found in *adv. Marc.* 4, 36 = 546, 12 and occurs for the first time in Tert.) is only used by Christian authors (*Thes.* 1. L. V, 2: 614; note in addition Aug. *confess.* 10, 12). As to the metaphor, cf. *adv. Iud.* 1, 5/6: *nubilo quodam veritas obumbrabatur*; *apol.* 47, 3; *adv. Marc.* 4, 25 (503, 24; ∞ Luc. 10, 21): *aenigmatum nebulas* (see also Engelbrecht, *Claud. Mam.*, 21/2). Afterwards it is frequently used referring to the allegoric interpretation of Holy Scripture, e. g. Hier. *in Isai.* 6, 1 *seqq.* (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 3: 104, 22/3): *Origeni qui allegoriae nubilo universa confundit*; *de Exod. in vigil. Pasch.* (*ib.* III, 2: 408, 1/2); Orig. *homil. in Levit.* 1, 1; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 10 (105, 14/5 Batiff.-Wilm.). — *argumentationes originales, id est philosophicas*: *originales* should certainly be retained, though it does not make an antithesis to *caelestes*. Tert. means arguments of the 'patriarchs' of the heretics, i. e. the philosophers; the adject. *originales* points back to *patriarchis* in § 1. In *apol.* 21, 4 the faith of the patriarchs is called *fides originalium auctorum*; cf. also mon. 7: *post vetera exempla originalium personarum* and Ambrosiast. *in 1 Tim.* 1, 3/4: *fabulis quas narrare consueti sunt Iudaei de generatione suarum originum, de Abraham et Isaac et ceteris patriarchis*. It is possible, though not very probable, that *originalis* here has the secondary meaning 'antiquated', which is found in the Latin translation (It. and Vulg.) of 2 Petr. 2, 5: *originali* (ἀρχαίου)

mundo non pepercit. As is evident from the remaining part of the sentence, the *argumentationes philosophicae* are *fons et origo mali* in a twofold sense, for they lead astray both pagans and Christians (the latter through the intermediary of the heretics). It is fairly surprising that there is no such strongly marked antithesis between *originales* and *caelestes* as between *argumentationes* (see the note on 2, 5) and *definitiones*, or *philosophicas* and *dominicas*; however, we should not overlook, firstly, that it is hardly possible to find a notion diametrically opposed to *originalis*, secondly, that not seldom defective parallelism is found in Tert.'s works (cf. e. g. 50, 3). For the adjunct. *dominicus*, see Löfst., *Per.*, 76 and *Synt.*, 1, 93 seqq. — *ethnici*: 'pagans'; see for this 'Christianism', Mohrm., *Aug.*, 110 and Sainio, 42/6. Usually Tert. translates τὰ ἔθνη by *nationes*, cf. von Soden, *Festgabe Jülicher*, 259. — **a philosophia**: see comm. on 2, 5. — **retundantur** = *refellantur*, a meaning very common in Tert.'s works, e. g. *adv. Prax.* 20 (263, 3); 27 (280, 8); *adv. Marc.* 2, 29 (376, 5); 4, 1 (423, 9).

4. **ut praefati sumus**, viz. in 1,1. At the end of the preface Tert. refers to its beginning (cf. the notes on 25, 1 and 50, 1). — **inobsecurabili**: Τρ (not ἄλ.), as is indicated by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 143; also Aug. in *Ps.* 41, 2; *Acta concil. oecumen.* ed. Schwartz, IV, 2: 65,3). As to the quotation of Gen. 2, 7, see comm. on 9,7; for the use of *regula* by Tert., see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 57 (1929), 36₄. — **revolvendum**: 'to be repeated' (cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 190; Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 102). — **suum titulum**: 'a special book', i. e. *De censu animae*. *titulus* is equivalent here to *liber* (for instances, see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 13; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 2, 1 (333, 7) and 2, 3 (336, 16). For the use of *suus*, cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 4: *sicut de illis* (sc. *spectaculis*) *suum volumen edidimus*; *idol.* 13 (44, 8).

4. *The soul is both born and created.*

"After the origin of the soul we must discuss its essence. — Our assertion that it has sprung from the breath of God compels us to attribute a beginning to it <, as we also did in the treatise *De censu animae*>. Plato says that the soul is unborn and uncreated, whereas we declare it to be both born and created, by virtue of its having a beginning. We are not wrong in endowing it with both qualities, for frequently two different notions have much in common; thus 'to be born' as well as 'to be created' may be regarded as equivalent to 'being put in existence'. The creator of something is sometimes called its father, as Plato himself does. <So there can be no objection to calling the soul a 'created' as well as a 'born' substance>. At all events, I have refuted Plato's view both by this argument and by means of Holy Scripture <viz. in *De censu animae*>".

According to Karpp (37₉), the influence of Soranus is already perceptible in this chapter, because the latter author, too, declared the soul to have a temporal beginning (*gyn.* p. 30, 22 seq. Ilberg). It is not impossible that Soranus discussed this subject in a way

contrary to Plato's, but on the other hand we are not to overlook the following facts: firstly, Tert. was compelled by the structure of his work to discuss the *initium animae* immediately after the preface (similarly, death and eschatology are discussed at the end of the treatise), secondly, this subject had already been dealt with in *De censu animae* (see the Introduction, p. 13*; this discussion is clearly referred to by the imperfect subjunctive *deputaremus*). Hence it is much more probable that this chapter is no more than a continuation of the discussion in *De censu animae*, which at any rate contained the scriptural passages omitted here (see the note on the last sentence of this chapter); if this supposition is right, the only addition given here consists in the argument intended to prove that whatever is created is also born. That this argument was invented by Tert. himself, is evident from the following consideration: Plato had declared the soul to be a ἀγέννητος οὐσία (*innata substantia*), whereas for Tert. on account of Gen. 2, 7 (see 3, 4 and 11, 3: *et anima enim flatus factus ex spiritu*) it was a *facta substantia*. In order to obtain the antithesis needed to refute Plato, he makes it appear that, according to this philosopher, the soul is *innata et infecta*, and himself declares it to be *nata et facta* (with regard to this we should not lose sight of the fact that these notions are found in relation with each other throughout the treatises *adv. Marc.* 1/2 and *adv. Hermog.*). However, when in the conclusion he mentions his *fides factae natae animae*, the predicate *facta* purposely comes first.

The passages quoted from Plato may have been borrowed from the source already used in *De censu animae*, probably the Ἐπιτομή of Albinus (see the Introduction, p. 44*).

1. *quaestionem . . . patitur*: a law term (cf. *dig.* 5, 3, 7, 1; 11, 7, 14, 7; see Beck, 124), which also occurs in *cor.* 1, 41/2 and *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (618, 1/2). — *status*: see for the use of this word in Tert.'s works, Naumann, *Ztschr. f. Kathol. Theol.* 58 (1934), 339₁₁. — *Consequens . . . est, ut*: this expression, which is found from Cic. downwards (Thes. 1. L. IV: 412, 22/39), is extremely frequent in Tert.; in *adv. Marc.* 5, 10 (606, 1/2) *consequens est* is followed by an infin. — *enim* ('so') opens the discussion, as in 58, 2: *Cur enim non putes . . . ?* (cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 680 and Thes. 1. L. V, 2: 588, 3/52). — *deputaremus*: this reading (B Gel.) is supported by the clausula (1α). Hoppe has collected a number of passages (*Synt.*, 67/8), in which the imperfect subjunctive is found in a subordinate clause after a present indicative in the principal sentence (mostly a neutral adjct. followed by *est*, as in this passage); however, in all these instances the subjunctive has the function of an *irrealis*, e. g. *apol.* 11, 4: *indignum est, ut alicuius opera indigeret* (sc. deus). On the other hand, an example similar to this passage is found in *adv. Marc.* 2, 21 (364, 8/10, overlooked by Hoppe): *consequens enim est, ut ea opera sabbato auferret* (= *abstulerit*, sc. deus), *quae sex diebus supra indixerat, tua scilicet, id est humana et cotidiana*. Since it is certain that in the treatise *De censu animae* Tert. discussed the soul's being created (24, 2: *quod natam eam agnos-*

cimus . . . *Satis de isto cum Hermogene*), we are perfectly justified in supposing that he refers here to that passage, and so may regard the instance just quoted from *adv. Marc.* 2, 21 as strictly parallel. — **Hoc Plato . . . volens**: Plato only called the soul ἀγέννητος (e. g. *Phaedr.* 246 A), as is also stated in doxographical literature, e. g. Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 19, 10 (*D D G* 568, 10/1): καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν οἱ μὲν φασὶν αὐτὸν ἀγέννητον λέγειν καὶ ἄφθαρτον; *D D G* 587, 9 and 591, 18; Albin. *Isag.* 5 (157, 31 Herm.), and 25 (178, 12/5); for the reason of this alteration, see the preface to this chapter. The combination of *innatus* and *infectus* is frequently found in Tert., especially in connection with the nature of God, e. g. 21, 7: *deo . . . ut soli innato et infecto*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 3 (293, 22), etc.; cf. also *apol.* 11, 5: *totum enim hoc mundi corpus sive innatum et infectum secundum Pythagoram, sive natum factumve secundum Platonem*; *adv. Herm.* 12 (139, 13); 23 (151, 24); *res.* 11 (40, 2/3). — **Et natam . . . et factam**: it is evident that for Tert. *facta* is the more important notion (see the preface to this ch.); however, we also find *definimus animam dei flatu natam* (22, 2) and *hoc ipso animam longe infra deum expendimus, quod natam eam agnoscimus* (24, 2). The latter passage shows that Tert. does not regard birth as a higher origin than creation, as was done afterwards (cf. *Prudent. apoth.* 791/2: *non tamen ipsa deus (anima), quoniam generatio non est, sed factura dei*: see my discussion of this passage in *Mnemos.* III 11 (1943), 75/7). A similar statement is found in *adv. Herm.* 32 (161, 9/10): *nihil interest, facta an nata sit abyssus, dum initium detur illi*. — **ex initii constitutione** “on account of our stating that it has a beginning”; in the sense of *probatio, confirmatio*, the subst. *constitutio* is found from Cic. downwards (Thes. I. L. IV: 526, 52 *seqq.*). — **Nec statim erravimus**: Borleffs proposes to read *errabimus*; indeed Tert. also puts a future indicative after *non statim*, cf. *adv. Prax.* 13 (249, 24/5): *solem autem nominans, cuius est radius, non statim et radium solem appellabo*; *fuga* 1, 2; 14, 1. The addition of *istud animalibus* is necessary; omissions of this kind are frequently found, also in B, e. g. 6, 2: *quae aut faciat corpus animale, si adsit, aut inanimale, si absit ab illo (si adsit, aut inanimale om. B)*. — **differentiae** of course has the concrete meaning ‘*res differentes*’, for which see Thes. I. L. V, 1: 1068, 17/48. — **habendo** is used instead of a present participle with concessive meaning (see comm. on 2, 6). — **passivitatē commercia**: Tert. means to say that the notions ‘to be born’ and ‘to be created’ are not mutually exclusive and even have much in common, as both may be qualified as an ‘obtaining of existence’ (*accipere esse, τὸ εἶναι δέχασθαι*); so „they have points of contact, which are due to (inherent in) their extensiveness” (Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 50: “sie können sich über ihre Grenzen ausdehnen und mit einander zusammen-treffen”). For *commercium* with the meaning ‘*societas, communitas, communicatio*’, see Thes. I. L. III: 1877, 70 *seqq.* (also *ad nat.* 1, 4, 11 and *res.* 49 = 101, 12). As to the use of the genit., cf. *ad nat.* 2, 5, 15: *licentia passivitatē* (“the vagueness which is the natural consequence of the promiscuity”). The subst. *passivitas* is found for the first time in Tert. (afterwards it is very rare) . *passivus*, ‘dispersed’ > ‘general’,

'ubiquitous', 'promiscuous', is found for the first time in Apul. *met.* 6, 10: *seminum istorum passivam congeriem*; *ib.* 9, 36 (the adverb 11, 3). In Tert.'s works it is frequently found, e. g. *ad ux.* 1, 2: *per licentiam tunc passivam*; *adv. Val.* 5 (182, 6); *pud.* 2 (223, 27); *adv. Marc.* 1, 7 (298, 17/8): *de nomine dei . . . ut passivo et in alios quoque permissio*; 1, 20 (315, 26); *mon.* 6; *c. Chr.* 24, 22; *ad nat.* 2, 1, 13, 14; *iei.* 2 (275, 27); the adverb *passivitus* occurs in *pall.* 3, 7. *Passivitas* occurs in *apol.* 9, 17: *-te luxuriae* (Waltz., *comm.*, 79: "*= usus promiscuus, usage général, généralité*"); *ad nat.* 2, 5, 15; *cor.* 8, 25; *adv. Marc.* 4, 16 (472, 10); *pall.* 4, 8: *quantum denotatui passivitas* ('promiscuity') *offert? libertinos in equestribus*, etc.; the meaning 'confusion' is found in *adv. Herm.* 41 (170, 22 *seqq.*): *inquires . . . turbulentia . . . passivitas*; *adv. Val.* 30 (206, 9); *anim.* 46, 2; cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 66/7; Rönsch, *It.*², 54 and *N. T. T.*, 667; du Cange s. v. — The words *Capit . . . generatur* contain a confused syllogism as is frequently found in Tert.'s works (see *comm.* on 6, 1/2). In its normal form it might run as follows: *capit itaque et 'facturam'* (= 'fieri') *pro 'generari' dici, siquidem omne quod fit in esse ponitur* (εἰς τὸ εἶναι τίθεται), *et omne quod quoquo modo accipit esse* (= *in esse ponitur*), *generatur*. The conclusion has been omitted, the major premiss is introduced by *itaque*, and the minor (in which subject and predicate have been interchanged, a method frequent in Tert.'s works; cf. e. g. 7, 4) is represented as the motivation of the major. In the first sentence the reading given by B may be retained, if we assume an ellipsis of *dici* after *capit*: ἐνδέχεται οὖν καὶ 'ποίησιν' ('ποιεῖσθαι') ἀντὶ τοῦ 'εἰς τὸ εἶναι τεθῆναι' (sc. λέγεσθαι). For *capit* as a translation of ἐνδέχεται (from *It.* downwards; very frequent in Tert.), see *Thes. l. L. III*: 333, 27/37; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 16 and *Synt.*, 48; Rönsch, *It.*², 351/2 and *N. T. T.*, 613; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 430₂. In Tert.'s works it is often followed by *dicere* or *dici*, e. g. 6, 2: *quodsi non capit animale corpus dici . . . quod est anima*; *res.* 26 (64, 4/5); *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (537, 24); 5, 10 (607, 5); 5, 14 (624, 3); 2, 9 (346, 7): *capit etiam imaginem spiritus dicere flatum*. In the present passage Tert. wants to avoid an accumulation of infinitives (*pro in esse poni dici*); similar instances are found in 28, 4: *respice ad hypogeum eius et, si capit* (sc. *credi*), *crede* and *Iren. lat.* 2, 22, 2: *non capit igitur Dei Sophiam . . . sub passione cecidissee, et talem ignorantiam concepisse* (Harvey *ad loc.*: "*Non capit* as elsewhere for οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, sub. τὸ λέγειν"). Cf. also *Arist. phys.* 6, 10 (241 b 5/6): οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τὸ οὕτως ἀδύνατον τέμνεσθαι (sc. τέμνεσθαι) and [*Arist.*] *de spir.* 8 (485 a 15): τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀποδα ὅλως ἐγχαρεῖ (sc. εἶναι), and for the ellipsis of *dicere*, 42, 1: *de morte iam superest*. — *facturam* is not to be interpreted with *Thes. l. L. VI*, 1: 143, 15/6 as '*res creata*'; it is certainly equivalent to Gr. τὸ ποιεῖσθαι, in which sense it is only found in theological writings of the fourth century (*Thes.*, *loc. cit.*, 142, 18/24), e. g. *Faustin. de trin.* 2, 1: *filius ex nativitate consistit, creatura . . . ex factura*; *Aug. contra Iulian. op. imperf.* 6, 18: *facturae suae . . . condicione* ("his condition of being created"). — *in esse poni* is equivalent to εἰς τὸ εἶναι τεθῆναι, as is evident from the words *accipit esse* (the interpretation by me in

Mnemos. III, 3 (1936), 169, according to which *inesse* here means *esse*, must be recanted). Cf. Plato *Sophist.* 219 B: πᾶν, ὅπερ ἂν μὴ πρότερόν τις ὄν ὕστερον εἰς οὐσίαν ἄγῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄγοντα ποιεῖν, τὸ δὲ ἀγόμενον ποιῆσθαι πού φαμεν. In the works of Philo and in Christian literature similar definitions of creation are very frequent, e. g. *de opif. mundi* 81: τὰ μὴ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγεῖν; *de spec. leg.* 4, 187; Rom. 4, 17; *Hermas vis.* 1, 1, 6 and *mand.* 1, 1, 1; many other instances are quoted in the notes of Lietzmann on Rom. 4, 17 (*Hdb. N. T.* 8, p. 55) and of Dibelius on *Hermas*, *loc. cit.* (*ib.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 433 and 497). However, in these passages an influence of Plato (or of Greek philosophy in general) is not probable, this being a specifically Christian formula belonging to liturgy and probably borrowed from an ancient Judaic prayer (see Lietzmann, *loc. cit.*; Dibelius' view is not quite clear). As far as I know, literal translations of this formula into Latin, or allusions to it, do not occur before the fourth century, e. g. Mar. Victorin. *de generat. verb. div.* 6: *at illa quae vere non sunt, non recipit in esse plenitudo dei*; *ib.* 25: *ut ad esse ducantur quae esse non possunt*; *Anthol. Lat.* 785 b, 3 (by Augustine, who was a pupil of Mar. Victorin.): *dissolvit tempus, quicquid producit adesse* (read *ad esse*; cf. Theob. Brito *Abbrev. symbol. apost. exposit.* (Casp., *Anecd.*, p. 300): *quia illud, quod non fuit, produxit ad esse*). — With substantival meaning an infin. after prepositions is first found in translations from the Greek after *inter* (earliest instance: Cic. *fin.* 2, 43), in negative sentences after *praeter* (from Hor. *sat.* 2, 5, 69 downwards); a freer use is not found before the second century after Christ (see Hofm., *Synt.*, 578; Wölfflin, A. L. L. 3, 70/91; Brenous, 344; Rönsch, *It.*², 430; Linderbauer, 355; Stix, 14/5; Juret, *Filastr.*, 111; Hedfors, 130 and 143/4; for Tert., cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 78/9; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 19 *seqq.* and *Synt.*, 42). In general Tert. only rarely uses an infin. in this way: in *ad nat.* 1, 5, 6 after *inter*, in *cult. fem.* 2, 11, 1 after *propter*; perhaps *adv. Marc.* 2, 13 (353, 11/3) may be added: *sic denique omnipotens, quia et iuvandi et laedendi potens* (sc. deus). *Minus est tantummodo prodesse, quia non aliud quid possit cum prodesse* (viz. *laedere*; Kroymann follows the third edition of Beatus Rhenanus in writing *quam* instead of *cum*). After *pro* an infin. is very seldom found (e. g. *append. Aug. ep.* 19, 4, 5: *pro posse dicere*); in the present passage it is undoubtedly a Grecism. — *accipit esse*: 'τὸ εἶναι δέχεται'; for the use of an infin. with substantival meaning as the subject or object of the sentence, see Hoppe, *loc. cit.* — *Nam . . . diei*: so the *factor* is a 'generator', and *fieri* is equivalent to *generari*; this sentence furnishes another proof for the omitted conclusion of the preceding argument. — *sic et Plato utitur*, viz., in *Tim.* 28 C: τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν (Cic. translates: *illum . . . quasi parentem huius universitatis*, Chalcid. (translat. 9): *opificem genitoremque universitatis*). The same passage is quoted in *apol.* 46, 9: *licet Plato adfirmet factitorem universitatis neque inveniri facilem et inventum enarrari in omnes difficilem*; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (580, 12): *quis parens, nisi qui et factor?*; *adv. Prax.* 8 (238, 22/3): *quia omnis origo*

parens est. This sentence is often quoted by Philo (see the index by Leisegang), Apul. (*de deo Socr.* 3 = 9, 9/10 Thom.; *de Plat.* 1, 5 = 86, 17/8 and 1, 11 = 95, 9), and Christian apologists, e. g. Justin *apol.* 2, 10, 6; Athenag. *legat.* 6 (124, 23/5 Geffck.); Min. Fel. 19, 14 and 26, 12; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 4; Lactant. *div. instit.* 1, 8, 1 (see Norden, *Agn. Theos.* 84₂) and *de ira dei* 11, 11; cf. also Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 174/5 and *Griech. Lit. Gesch.*, 2 (annotat.), p. 122, note 42; G. Kutsch, *In Lactant. de ira dei quaest.* (Leipsic 1933), 70/1. — *igitur . . . quoque*: a plausible paraphrase of this sentence is given by La Cerda: “Igitur quantum ad hoc depellimus quaestionem Philosophiae (this, however, is wrong; see below) de anima nata vel facta . . ., et praeterea auctoritate Prophetiae dicentis animam flatu dei constituisse”. Tert. declares to have refuted Plato’s view both by his argument and by his appeal to Holy Scripture (he overlooks the fact that his own argument only refers to the relation between the notions ‘born’ and ‘created’, and that the discussion as a whole is founded on the *initii constitutio*, which in its turn is based on a text from Holy Scripture, so that the insertion of *quoque* after *auctoritate prophetiae* is not justified). *Prophetia* is once more equivalent to *scriptura sacra* (see the note on 2, 3), Gen. 2, 7 being meant; the genit. *philosophi* refers to Plato, as in 6, 7: *proinde et philosophus exhibeat illam* (sc. *animam*) *incorporalibus pasci* (both ch. 4 and 6 are levelled at Plato). That this interpretation must be the right one, is evident from the next sentence (5, 1): *Accerserit Eubulum aliquem et Critolaum et Xenocraten et isto in loco amicum Platonis Aristotelem*, in which the subject of *accerserit* can only be Plato. The close connection between these sentences also suffices to refute Kroymann’s view (*Quaest. Tert.*, 102) that a fairly extensive lacuna should be assumed between ch. 4 and 5: there is no question of an ‘abrupt transition’ (see also the comm. on 5, 1). Kroymann’s second argument, viz., that in spite of the words *auctoritate prophetiae quoque* Tert. quotes no scriptural text, is equally invalid, as these words clearly refer to Gen. 2, 7, which is quoted in 3, 4 and referred to at the beginning of this chapter (*ex dei flatu animam professi*). Plato is not seldom regarded as the φιλόσοφος κατ’ἐξοχήν, e. g. Clem. Alex. *strom.* 7, 16, 101, 4: ὥς δὲ ἐὰν πρόσσχη τις Ἰσχομάχῳ, γεωργὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσῃ, . . . καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει φυσικόν, καὶ φιλόσοφον Πλάτωνι; see also comm. on 1, 2 for *magister* as a qualification of Socrates. — *quoque*: in *adv. Marc.* 4, 3 (428, 22) too this is the last word of the chapter (there too we find the clausula 1 δ).

5. *List of philosophers upholding the corporeality of the soul; the arguments of the Stoics in favour of this view.*

“After this defeat Plato may well summon to his aid Eubulus, Critolaus, Xenocrates, and even Aristotle, who, concerning this subject, for once agrees with him. However, when they have once gathered together, they may perhaps prefer to deprive the soul of its corporeality, though the far greater number of philosophers holding the contrary

view may discourage them (§ 1). Of the latter such philosophers should be mentioned first as declare the soul to consist of manifestly corporeal substances such as fire (Hipparchus and Heraclitus), water (Hippo and Thales), blood (Empedocles and Critias), atoms (Epicurus), or a 'fifth substance' (Critolaus and his Peripatetics). To these the Stoics may be added, who define the soul as a *spiritus*, and so do not greatly diverge from the Christian view (§ 2)". — Next Tert. mentions four well-known Stoic arguments in favour of the corporeality of the soul (§§ 3/6).

This chapter is entirely based on data from doxographical literature, which were undoubtedly borrowed from Soranus; in §§ 3/6 some of the Stoic arguments have been translated literally from the Greek source. For the rather curious list of philosophers in § 1, see the comm. *ad loc.*

1. Obviously the dat. *auxilio* should be added mentally to *accerserit*. To my knowledge, this ellipsis is found nowhere else (see Thes. I. L. II: 452, 14/9). The perfect subjunctive *accerserim* is very rare (in Thes. I. L. II: 449, 30/50 only Porphy. in Hor. *epod.* 17, 61 is quoted besides the present passage; in Ovid *met.* 15, 625 and Quint. *instit.* 7, 3, 33 the reading is doubtful; Wölfflin's discussion of these forms (A. L. L. 8, 285) is inaccurate). — *Eubulum*: Tert. certainly means one Eubulus, who was a member of the Middle Academy (second century after Christ; see von Arnim, art. 'Eubulos' 17, R. E. VI, 879, and Überweg-Prächter, 671). The addition of *aliquem*, which is not joined on to the other names in this list, clearly shows that the name did not mean anything to Tert. (the cases where *aliqui(s)* is added to a name not mentioned in a list should be distinguished; see the note on 15, 2: *Messenius aliqui Dicaearchus*). — *Critolaus*: the mention of this philosopher in this context is probably due to an error: Critolaus against the Stoics upheld the view that the world has no beginning (see Philo Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου 6 *seqq.* = p. 90, 4 *seqq.* Cohn-Wendland). The error was almost certainly made by Tert., not by Soranus (see for Tert.'s errors in this treatise the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3); hence it is not probable either that this list in its entirety was borrowed from doxographical literature through the intermediary of this author (see the note on *Aristotelen* below); since it contains several Platonists, it may partly hark back to Albinus. — *Xenocraten*: cf. Plut. *de animae procreat.* in *Timaeo* 3 (1013 A; in the preceding sentences Xenocrates, Crantor, and Zaratas the Pythagorean were mentioned: ὁμαλῶς δὲ πάντες οὗτοι χρόνῳ μὲν οἴονται τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ γεγονέναι μηδ' εἶναι γενητήν, πλείονας δὲ δυνάμεις ἔχειν, εἰς ἃς ἀναλύοντα θεωρίας ἔνεκα τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῆς λόγῳ τὸν Πλάτωνα γιγνομένην ὑποτίθεσθαι καὶ συγκεραυνωμένην (Heinze, *Xen.*, frag. 67 connects this passage with completely different ones). — *isto in loco*: 'in this province,' 'where this question (viz. whether or not the soul has a beginning) is concerned' (*iste* = *hic*, see note on 1,1); cf. *in ista . . . specie* 25, 3. The same expression is found in *apol.* 39, 12: *in isto loco consortium solvimus, in quo solo ceteri homines consortium exercent* (P; *in isto solo* FR;

see Waltz., *Ét.*, 340/1). — *Platonis amicum Aristotelen*: La Cerda rightly points out that this allusion to the well-known proverb *amicus Plato, magis amica veritas* is especially malicious, as, according to Tert., *isto in loco* both 'friends' are equally wrong. The proverb harks back to *Eth. Nicom.* 1096 a 16: ἀμφοῖν (sc. Truth and Plato) . . . ὄντων φίλοις ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀληθείαν; cf. also *Vita Arist.* (Rose, *Arist. Fragm.*, p. 439, 1/2), where this utterance of Plato is recorded: Σωκράτους μὲν ἐπ'ὀλίγον φροντιστέον, τῆς δὲ ἀληθείας ἐπὶ πολὺ (Latin transl. *ib.* 447, 2/3: *amicus quidem Socrates, sed magis amica veritas*). Perhaps a late instance of this proverb may be found in Euseb. *Theophan.* 2, 41 (97, 17/8 Gressmann): "But may this man (i. e. Plato) not be honoured more than Truth", and in Adamant. 1, 13: *non Eutropius tibi, sed veritas adversatur*. Aristotle nowhere qualifies the soul as ἀγένητος, nor does doxography ascribe this view to him, so that the insertion of his name in this context may be entirely due to Tert.'s wish to ridicule the well-known proverb. — *Fortassean*: an archaism reintroduced by Gellius (cf. *Thes.* 1. L. VI: 1143, 1/22; Sjögren, *Tull.*, 128; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 42/3). This is the only passage in which Tert. joins this word on to an indic. (the only two other passages in which this is found are Gell. 19, 8, 6 and Apul. *apol.* 34). — *exstruentur* of course has the sense of a Greek medium, παρασκευάζονται. — *magis* is almost equivalent here to *potius* (see the note on 29, 1). — *ad auferendam animae corpulentiam*: *animae* is almost certainly a genit., cf. 38, 3: *auferenda est . . . argumentatoris occasio*; 43, 7: *nox . . . auferens rerum etiam colorem*; *ad nat.* 2, 5, 13: *auferendo summum gradum auctoris*; for further particulars, see the note on 6, 3. This sentence forms a transition to the next subject, i. e. the corporality of the soul, the discussion of which extends to the end of ch. 9. — *et quidem plures*: for Tert. a highly important argument, cf. for instance 15, 3: *Sed plures et philosophi adversus Dicaearchum . . . et medici adversus Andream et Asclepiaden . . . iamque omnibus plures Christiani*. It is not impossible that this argument should be traced back to the Sceptics through the intermediary of Soranus; cf. e. g. Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 8, 350: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἐπιτρέψωσιν αὐτῷ (sc. Δημητρίῳ τῷ Λάκωνι) τὸ τοιοῦτο (λέγω δὲ εἰδικὴν τινα καταστήσασθαι ἀπόδειξιν εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς γενικῆς), οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμογενῶν αἰρέσεων οὐχ ἡσυχάσουσιν, ἀλλ' ὅποιαν ἂν προχειρίσῃται ὡς πιστὴν ἀπόδειξιν, ταύτην ἀνατρέψουσι, πολλὴ τε πληθὺς ἔξει τῶν οὐκ ἐόντων ταύτην τεθῆναι. οἷον εἰ τὴν περὶ ἀτόμων λαμβάνοι, ἀμύθητοι ἀντιφθέγγονται αὐτῷ· εἰ τὴν περὶ κενοῦ, παμπληθεῖς ἐνστήσονται· εἰ τὴν περὶ εἰδώλων, ὡσαύτως. — Tert. writes *e contrario*, but *ex contrariis* (8, 1), and *contrarium ex contrario* (29, 3); cf. Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 51₁; Hofm., *Synt.*, 528.

2. Hipparchus is mentioned wrongly instead of Hippasus, cf. Aët. 4, 3, 4: Παρμενίδης δὲ καὶ Ἰππασος πυρώδη (sc. τὴν ψυχὴν); Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 5, 18; Hippasus, frag. 7/8 Diels. The same error occurs in Macrobi. *somn. Scip.* 1, 14, 19 and Nemes. *de nat. hom.* p. 169 Matth. For the origin of this error (which occurred before Soranus),

see *DDG*, 213, and Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 94/5. Other errors in this combination are found in [Justin] *cohort.* 3, 9 (Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Μεταπόντιος instead of Ἡρ. καὶ Ἰππ. ὁ Μ.; see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 270₁) and in Philo *de provid.* 1, 22 (*Heraclides et Hippasus*). — **Hippon et Thales**: Aët. 4, 3, 9; Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 2; Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 16, 2; Philopon. *de anim.* p. 4 (*DDG*, 214). — **Empedocles et Critias**: Galen *de dogm. Hippocr. et Plat.* 2, 8 (p. 248 Müller); Macrobi., *loc. cit.*; Critias frag. A 23 Diels; Emped. frag. A 4. 30. 76. 97 Diels; cf. Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 133/4 and 127/8. — **Epicurus ex atomis**: no such statement is found in doxography (Aët. 4, 3, 11: 'Ε. κράμα ἐκ τεττάρων). — **corpulentias** is almost equivalent to *corpora* (the plur. is found only here; the sing. is more frequent, e. g. 9, 8; 28, 2; *res.* 45 (93, 16); *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (393, 8); *c. Chr.* 3, 44). — **Critolaus**: Macrobi. *loc. cit.*: *Cr. Peripateticus constare eam de quinta essentia*; Aët. *plac.* 1, 7, 21: Κριτόλαος καὶ Διόδωρος ὁ Τύριος νοῦν ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἀπαθοῦς. — **spiritum praedicantes animam**: *St. V. F.* 1, 135/40; 2, 773 *seqq.* — **nobiscum** = *sicut nos* (many instances were collected by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.* 1, 58/9). — **qua** has causal meaning as in 9, 2. 6; 39, 1 (see Hofm., *Synt.*, 768; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 43; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 123). — **proxima inter se flatus et spiritus**: as was discussed in *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (see also comm. on ch. 11).

3. **Zeno . . . animam**: Macrobi. *loc. cit.* (*St. V. F.* 1, 137): *Zenon* (sc. dixit animam) *concretum corpori spiritum*; Diog. Laert. 7, 156 (*ib.* 2, frag. 774; cf. *ib.* 778): τὸ συμφυές ἡμῶν πνεῦμα — **instruit** (sc. *argumentationem*) instead of *struit* on account of the clausula; see the comm. on 10,3. — **Quo . . . digresso**: a different form of this syllogism is found in Chalcid. *comm. in Tim.* 220 (*St. V. F.* 1, frag. 138): *spiritum quippe animam esse Zenon quaerit hactenus: quo recedente a corpore moritur animal, hoc certe anima est, naturali porro spiritu recedente moritur animal: naturalis igitur spiritus anima est*. On account of this passage, Gomperz altered the text of Tert. (see the *appar. crit.*); in refutation of this alteration, von Arnim (*St. V. F.*, *loc. cit.*) rightly observes: "Mihi etiam formam syllogismi apud Tertullianum traditam defendi posse persuasum est. Nam verba „consitum spiritum definiens animam" fundamentum indicant, cui Zeno hunc syllogismum superstruxit". The two syllogisms are totally different: Chalcidius dwells upon the identity of the soul and the *spiritus naturalis*, without caring for the question whether or no the soul is corporeal. The addition by Ursinus of the words *consitus autem spiritus anima est* before the conclusion is superfluous, as this assertion is already found at the beginning (*consitum spiritum definiens animam*): according to Tert., Zeno's demonstration of the corporeality of the soul is based on his definition of it as πνεῦμα συμφυές. Instead of *consitus*, Tert. writes *consatus* in 43, 2. 4; cf. his use of both *infarsus* (*pall.* 4, 3) and *infersus* (*adv. Marc.* 3, 10 = 392, 14).

4. The arguments mentioned in this and the next two paragraphs have obviously also been borrowed from Soranus. Karpp, 36, rightly

refers to *gynaec.* p. 27, 37 Ilberg, where Soranus mentions the hereditary transmission of mental qualities. — **Cleanthes**: Nemes. *de nat. hom.* p. 32 Matth. (*St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518): ὁ Κλ. τοιόνδε πλέκει συλλογισμόν· οὐ μόνον, φησίν, ὅμοιοι τοῖς γονεῦσι γινόμεθα κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῖς πάθεσι, τοῖς ἡθεσι, ταῖς διαθέσεσι. σώματος δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ ἀνόμοιον, οὐχὶ δὲ ἄσωμάτου, σῶμα ἄρα ἡ ψυχὴ; cf. Zeller, III, 1⁴, 198. This argument is mentioned again in 25, 9. The resemblance of children to their parents is used as an argument in a different context by Chrysippus (*St. V. F.* 2, 806) and Panaetius (*Cic. Tusc.* 1, 79). — **similitudinem . . . respondere**: the right interpretation of this sentence is given by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 50); instead of writing *similitudine parentibus filios respondere* (cf. 25, 9: *Unde, oro, similitudine animae quoque parentibus de ingeniis respondemus secundum Cleanthis testimonium . . . ?*), Tert. makes the most important notion (*similitudo*) the subject of the sentence; for more instances of this use, see Thörn., *loc. cit.* The reading given by B, *filios*, cannot possibly be retained (Thörn. still wavers on account of the passages in which Tert. uses *in c. accus.* instead of *in c. abl.*). *fili* of course means 'children' here as in *ad nat.* 2, 9, 13; 2, 12, 5; 2, 14, 8; *ad ux.* 1, 6; see Thes. I. L. VI: 757, 43/61; Svonn., *Oros.*, 117; Thielmann, A. L. L. 8, 543. — **respondere**: likewise, Cypr. *de zel. et liv.* 15 (430, 5/6 H.): *si ad patrem liniamentis paribus suboles subsiciva respondeat*. — **itaque corpus**, sc. οὐσαν (or οὔσα; see comm. on the last sentence of § 5); cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 21. 45. 51/2; Eran. 16 (1916), 132; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 142. 144.

5. **Item**, etc.: Nemes., *loc. cit.* (*St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518): ἔτι δὲ ὁ Κλ. φησίν· οὐδὲν ἄσωματον συμπάσχει σῶματι, οὐδὲ ἄσωμάτῳ σῶμα, ἀλλὰ σῶμα σῶματι· συμπάσχει δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σῶματι νοσοῦντι καὶ τεμνομένῳ· καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῇ ψυχῇ· αἰσχυνομένης γοῦν ἐρυθρὸν γίνεται καὶ φοβουμένης ὠχρόν· σῶμα ἄρα ἡ ψυχὴ. The argument of the Epicureans is similar, cf. e. g. Lucr. 3, 175/6: *ergo corpoream naturam animi esse necessest, corporeis quoniam telis ictuque laborat* (see Heinze, *Lucr.* III, p. 71); Method. (*resurr.* 3, 18, 3) seems to have borrowed this argument from the Stoics. It was combated by Alex. Aphrodis., *de anima libri mant.* p. 117, 9 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 792). — **communicare**: the intransitive use of this verb is found for the first time in Tert. (Thes. I. L. III: 1957, 68). — **condolescit**: in a similar context this verb is used in Aug. *serm.* 348, 3: (animus) *compunctus laborantis miseria condolescit misericordia*. For Soranus, cf. Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 3, 13, 110: *timor enim per consensum animae corpori compatiens nasci perspicitur*. — Latinus' conjecture *coaeegrescit*, though creating a ἁ.λ., is necessary, a verb corresponding to *condolescit* being needed. *Coaegrotare* (συννοσεῖν) is found in Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 47 (apparently Soranus frequently used συννοσεῖν; see Wellmann, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 428). — **per detrimentum socii vigoris**: Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 52) proposes to read *suci et vigoris*, for which he refers to Ter. *Eun.* 318: *color verus, corpus solidum et suci plenum* with the note by Donatus: *sucus est humor in corpore, quo abundant bene valentes* (add Hor. *carm.* 3, 27, 54; Apul. *apol.* 63;

Priap. 32, 7; Muscio 1, 24 (11, 15; Rose writes *sui* instead of *suci*; in refutation of this, Medert, 26, refers to 2, 44 (72, 11) and 2, 83 = 109, 23); Cic. *Brut.* 36 and *orat.* 76 with Kroll's notes). Note, however, that B in 19, 3 writes *succi*, in 48, 1 *succus*, and in 51, 3 *exsuccior*, so that the reading *socii* should have proceeded from *succi*, which makes this conjecture much less plausible. Moreover, as to the sense *socii* is quite understandable; cf. 37, 5: *societatem carnis atque animae* (38, 1; 40, 1; 52, 3; 58, 4); 58, 6: *quod non sociata carne commisit* (sc. anima); 18, 1 (in a translation from Plato): *si quis illud* (sc. corpus) *socium assumpserit in quaestionem*; res. 15, *passim*; *ib.* 16 (45, 19/21); *an.* 52, 3: *sorum substantiarum*; cf. also Lucr. 3, 771 (see Heinze's note) and Prud. *apoth.* 931: *peccandi . . . socias* (sc. animam et carnem). So *socius vigor* should be interpreted as *socii vigor*; for this use, cf. Ovid *met.* 13, 949: *di maris exceptum socio dignantur honore* ("the honour due to a *socius*"); Apul. *met.* 4, 11: *manu socia . . . occumberet*; Prud. *psychom.* 683/4: *Discordia nostros intrarat cuneos sociam mentita figuram*; *cathem.* 10, 37/8: *Venient cito saecula, cum iam socius calor ossa revisat* (*socius calor* = *calor animae*; this phrase is very similar to the present passage); Cypr. Gall. *Num.* 408: *socium robur*. A similar use is found of the adjunct. *cognatus* (Thes. I. L. III: 1480, 44/73; from Catull. 68, 98: *prope cognatos compositum cineres* downwards; add Hegesipp. 2, 18, 1; 4, 7; *tract. de divit.* 6, 2; cf. also Prud. *psychom.* 477: *cognatam civilis agit discordia praedam*), *famulus* (Thes. I. L. VI: 270, 6/11, e. g. Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 10, 646: *vel famulas armare manus*; for Plaut. *Persa* 280a: *servam operam*, see Wack., *Synt.*, 2, 55), and *germanus* (Thes. I. L. VI: 1916, 6/32; also Iuvenc. 4, 20 and C. E. L. 706, 3). Finally, we may point out that Tert. has a partiality for the use of an adjunct. instead of a genit. (e. g. 6, 3 *sigillario motu*). — *Igitur anima corpus*: as in § 6, the conclusion, which Tert. cordially endorses, is given in the *oratio directa*; cf. also 43, 5. The inverse case is found in 6, 1.

6. Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 2 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 790): Χρύσιππος δὲ φησιν ὅτι "ὁ θάνατός ἐστι ψυχῆς χωρισμός ἀπὸ σώματος · οὐδὲν δὲ ἀσώματον ἀπὸ σώματος χωρίζεται · οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐφάπτεται σώματος ἀσώματον, ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ καὶ ἐφάπτεται καὶ χωρίζεται τοῦ σώματος, σῶμα ἄρα ἡ ψυχὴ". The value of this argument was contested by Alex. Aphrodis. *de anima libri mant.* p. 117, 21 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 792). — *manum ei porrigit*: this expression is frequently used by Tert., e. g. 43, 11; res. 53 (110, 14); *adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (422, 4/5); 4, 41 (562, 9). — *derelinqui*: this verb, rarely used before Colum., is especially common in juridical literature, and hence also in Tert. — *nec* = *ne . . . quidem* (12 times in *an.*; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 106/7). — *Lucretius*: the same verse is quoted in *adv. Marc.* 4, 8 (438, 16/7); cf. Arnob. 7, 28. For Tert.'s indebtedness to the poem of Lucretius, see Borleffs, *B Ph W* 52 (1932), 250/2 and the Introduction, p. 46*. — *affici morte*: Löfst. (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 56₁) rightly remarks that this may be one of those cases, in which the Latin language lacks a term equivalent to 'one', Fr. 'on'; *ib.*, 55/6, he refers to *scorp.* 14 (177, 17/8): *dehinc et exsequitur, quomodo velit subici* (A; *te subici* B Reiff.) *potestatibus*. An excellent parallel is

furnished by 30, 5: *in totum absumi periclitetur*, where Kroymann wrongly inserts *genus humanum* after *periclitetur* (see the comm. *ad loc.*). Cf. also Cic. *pro domo* 36, 96: *speravi, id quod accidit, me iacentem posse a vivis viris fortibus excitari: si una cum bonis interissem, nullo modo posse recreari* ("that . . . a recovery would be impossible"; Nägelsbach inserts *rem publicam* before *recreari*; see also Landgraf's comm. on *Rosc. Amer.*, p. 192). A slightly different case is found in Censorin. *de die nat.* 7, 2: *Hippon Metapontinus a septimo ad decimum mensem nasci posse* (*ib.* § 6; Gell. 3, 16, 6 (Censorinus' source) has *hominem nasci*); see also the comm. on 6, 9: *dum gignitur* ('during birth'). Of Greek authors cf. Iren. 1, 20, 3: διὰ πίστεως γὰρ καὶ ἀγάπης σώζεσθαι ("that . . . salvation is brought about by faith and charity").

6. *Refutation of the arguments in favour of the incorporeality of the soul.*

"I. The Platonists say: "Every body either contains a soul or does not; in the first case it is moved from the inside, in the second from the outside. The soul is moved in neither way, so it is not a body (§ 1)". In refutation of this the following arguments may be advanced: a) If the soul is a body, it is impossible to qualify it as an animate or inanimate body, for it is the very substance of the soul which bestows the predicate 'animate' upon bodies; so from the fact that it is neither animate nor inanimate we cannot conclude that it is not a body (§ 2). b) It may be true that it is proper to a body to be moved from the outside; now we have proved <in the treatise *De censu animae*> that the soul is moved from the outside, when falling into ecstasy or insanity, so it is a body. c) If it is proper to a body to be moved by another substance, it is still more proper to it to move another substance; now the soul moves the body <, so it is a body itself>. How should an incorporeal substance be able to move bodies? (§ 3).

II. Another argument of the Platonists runs as follows: "The qualities of corporeal substances are communicated to us by the senses of the body, but those of incorporeal substances by purely intellectual powers; now the soul is only known through the last-mentioned powers, so it is not a body" (§ 4). In refutation of this it may be pointed out that incorporeal things are also communicated to us by the senses of the body, for instance colour by sight; so inversely a corporeal soul may be supposed to be perceived by incorporeal powers (§ 5).

III. The third argument says: "Every body is nourished by corporeal substances, hence the soul, on account of its being nourished by incorporeal ones, cannot be a body". Against this Soranus already pointed out that the soul is also maintained by corporeal food. It is for this reason that he attributes to the soul a corporeal substance (and moreover mortality, which is wrong; but then Soranus was not a Christian) (§ 6). Now Plato ought to refute Soranus by demonstrating that the soul is nourished by incorporeal substances; but nobody has ever thought of feeding a soul on Plato's flowers of speech or on Aristotle's subtleties, when it threatened to leave the body. And

what are we to say about the numerous souls of barbarians and ignorant people, which are no less vigorous than other souls, though they lack the nourishment of wisdom? It is not the substance of the soul which is strengthened by scientific study, but its culture. Besides, the Stoics declare all arts and sciences to be corporeal; if this is true, the soul would even receive corporeal nourishment from wisdom, and so would certainly remain corporeal! (§ 7).

IV. The last argument is this: "The soul is in the body; in one and the same place there cannot possibly be two bodies, so the soul is not a body". Here philosophy is out of touch with reality; it might have corrected its view by paying attention to pregnant women, who carry one or even more children in their wombs (the code of law even mentions a Greek woman who gave birth to quintuplets) (§ 3). The entire creation may bear witness to the fact that bodies which are about to proceed from other bodies are already present in the place whence they proceed. <For this reason, too, two bodies may very well be in one and the same place> (§ 9)".

According to Karpp, 32/3, the entire chapter harks back to Soranus; however, a closer examination of its contents shows that a good deal may be said against this view. It is possible (though not certain; see the Introduction, p. 36*) that the doxographical materials, viz. the four arguments of the Platonists, were borrowed from the treatise *Περὶ ψυχῆς*, but this does not apply to the refutation. Firstly, it is surprising that Tert. does not mention the name of Soranus before discussing the third argument; if Karpp's supposition were right, we should rather expect this to take place either at the beginning of the chapter or not at all. As the case is, the conclusion is obvious that for the refutation Soranus was not consulted in passages preceding that in which he is mentioned for the first time. This conclusion is borne out by the following consideration: in the second argument advanced against the first syllogism of the Platonists Tert. refers to one of his earlier works; this leads us to the supposition that the entire argument was invented by him (see comm. on § 3). The curious play upon the ambiguous meaning of *accedere* in § 5 is typical of Tert. (see the comm.), and the first syllogism of the Platonists is quoted in an altered form, which makes it easier to refute, a method frequently found in Tert.'s works. So it seems right to suppose that in §§ 1/5 only the doxographical materials have been borrowed from Soranus. On the other hand, the refutation of the third argument certainly harks back to the Ephesian, which is also probable for the fourth (in § 8; see comm.). Nevertheless, several details of this section must surely be regarded as Tert.'s intellectual property, viz., the reference to the excellency of 'uneducated souls', the example of the quintuplets, which was taken from juridical literature, and the argument in § 9, which is based on Tert.'s doctrine of the Trinity.

So this chapter clearly shows how strongly Tert. qualified the materials taken from Soranus.

1. Tert. begins by refuting a syllogism of the Platonists which is

an elaboration of the argument found in *Phaedr.* 245 E; in a different form it has been preserved by Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 2 (p. 72 Matth.): Πᾶν σῶμα ἢτοι ἔξωθεν κινεῖται ἢ ἐνδοθεν · ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἔξωθεν, ἄψυχον ἔσται, εἰ δὲ ἐνδοθεν, ἔμψυχον. εἰ δὲ σῶμα ἡ ψυχὴ, εἰ μὲν ἔξωθεν κινεῖτο, ἄψυχός ἐστιν, εἰ δὲ ἐνδοθεν, ἔμψυχος · ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄψυχον καὶ τὸ ἔμψυχον λέγειν τὴν ψυχὴν · οὐκ ἄρα σῶμα ἡ ψυχὴ. For the sake of clearness I summarize both forms:

N e m.: "A. Every body is either moved from the outside or from the inside; in the first case it is inanimate, in the second it is animate.

B. It is equally absurd to call the soul inanimate as to call it animate.

C. So the soul is not a body".

T e r t.: "A. Every body is either inanimate or animate; in the first case it is moved from the outside, in the second from the inside.

B. The soul is neither moved from the outside (for it is not inanimate) nor from the inside (for it is the soul itself which moves the body).

C. So the soul is not a body".

I assume that Nemesius, who reproduces several syllogisms in exactly the same form as Tert. (see comm. on 5, 4. 5; 6, 6), and in general has the habit of recording doxographical data without altering anything in them, has preserved the original text. In the form transmitted by Tert. the predicates of the two sentences contained by the major premiss have changed places, so that the minor obtains another predicate ("is neither moved from the outside nor from the inside"). The argument for the last-mentioned assertion is very curious. The first part of the premiss ("the soul is not moved from the outside") is concluded from the fact that the soul is not inanimate; this conclusion is derived from the first part of the major premiss ("if a body is inanimate, it is moved from the outside"), but this derivation, though obvious, a negation being added in both parts, is logically inadmissible (on the other hand, this may be derived from the major premiss given by Nemesius: "If a body is moved from the outside, it is inanimate" → "If a body is not inanimate, it is not moved from the outside"; this may perhaps be regarded as a proof that in Soranus' work Tert. found the syllogism in the form given by Nemesius). The motivation of the second part of the minor premiss ("it is rather the soul which moves the body") reminds us so strongly of an argument found in § 3 (*si ab alio moveri corporis est, quanto magis movere aliud?*) that we cannot but ascribe it to Tert. himself. This again allows us to conclude that the arrangement of the entire argument is Tert.'s own work. The purpose of this arrangement is clear: it has the advantage that the remark "the soul is neither inanimate nor animate", which is the major premiss of the syllogism reproduced by Nemesius, remains still available for the refutation, and may be put forward as an argument invented by Tert. himself. — **animale . . . inanimale:** Cicero in his translation of *Phaedr.* 245 E (*somn. Scip.* 9, 28; *Tusc.* 1, 23, 54) writes *inanimum* and *animal*. — **si quidem:** the same argument is found in *adv. Herm.* 36 (166, 6/7): *omnia denique moventur aut a semetipsis, ut animalia, aut ab aliis, ut inanimalia*. — **videri:** in this argument, which is rejected by Tert., the conclusion is given

in the *accus. cum inf.*, whereas in the premisses an indic. is found; cf. the inverse case in 5, 5/6. — **corporaliū forma**: “according to the rule applying to corporeal substances (see comm. on 2, 2)”; cf. *ad nat.* 2, 3, 8: *etiam mortalia sint necesse est, secundum anim<alis> formam* (Gothofredus, Borleffs; it seems preferable to write *anim<aliū>*). — **quae . . . moveatur**: the repetition of one or even of both premisses at the end of the conclusion is proper to Tert.; many interesting instances of this method have been collected by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 20/3; for examples from other authors, see e. g. Wahlén, 72 *seqq.* and Norberg, 1, 55₂).

2. **Ad hoc . . . conveniunt**: “The argument (*definitionis*) of the Platonists does not really bear upon the soul (*incongruentiam*), for it is based on (*provocantis*) <a major premiss (viz. “every body is either animate or inanimate”) which contains> predicates (viz. ‘animate’ and ‘inanimate’) not applying to the soul (*ea quae in animam non conveniunt*)”. The refutation forms a vicious circle, for it starts from the tacit understanding that the soul is corporeal, which is the very opposite of the conclusion of the adversaries (the Platonists say: “A. Every body is either animate or inanimate. B. The soul is neither animate nor inanimate. C. So the soul is not a body”, whereas Tert. argues: “A. The soul is a body. B. The soul is neither animate nor inanimate. C. So it is not true that every body is either animate or inanimate”). To facilitate the refutation Tert. makes it appear that the major premiss of the Platonists refers to the soul, not to bodies in general (“if the soul is a body, it is either an animate or an inanimate body”); against this he argues: “The soul is neither animate nor inanimate (the minor premiss of the Platonists, which he too accepts), so it is neither an animate nor an inanimate body”. Now instead of agreeing with his adversaries that the soul is not a body at all, he concludes: “So the soul <, which of course is a body,> is a body which is neither animate nor inanimate, whence it follows that the disjunction found in the major premiss of the Platonists does not apply to the soul <and so is wrong, for it should also have included the <corporeal> soul>”. — **incongruentiam**: Tp (also *adv. Marc.* 2, 25 (369, 25) and *pud.* 15 = 250, 21). — **definitionis**: not ‘definition’, but ‘argumentation’, ‘syllogism’. This meaning is found fairly frequently in Tert.’s works of this period, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 16 (356, 18/20): *inde venit ad haereticos quoque definitio eiusmodi: si deus irascitur et aemulatur et extollitur et exacerbatur, ergo et corrumpetur, ergo et morietur*; *ib.* 2, 7 (343, 10); 4, 12 (453, 4); *res.* 49 (103, 11); *adv. Herm.* 12 (139, 20). To my knowledge, this meaning is not found in the works of other authors. — **provocantis ad**: cf. 2, 2. — **cum ipsa . . . ab illo**: Tert.’s satisfaction with this argument is evident from the fact that he repeats it in *res.* 53 (110, 26 *seqq.*): *anima . . . etsi corpus, tamen, quia ipsa est corpus non animatum sed animans potius, animale corpus non potest dici nec fieri quod facit. alii enim accidens facit illud animale*. — **quod facit . . . esse ipsa**: a different view about the relation between cause and consequence is expressed

in 10, 9: *Ipsum est enim quid, per quod est quid*; however, the latter thesis is entirely due to the context (see the comm. *ad loc.*). — *Anima ... nomine*: for animate bodies the soul is an *accidens* = *accedens* (see the comm. on § 5: *quorum exemplo etiam anima corpori accedit*), whereas for the soul itself it is its *substantia*; cf. also the passage just quoted from *res. 53*: *alii ... animale*. After *nomine* we should expect: *corporibus animalibus vero anima accedit tantum*. — *capit*: see comm. on ch. 4. — *Quodsi ... formam?*: since this *forma* can only be the rule which states that every body is either moved from the outside or from the inside, and Tert. at the end of his arguments has the habit of returning to the starting-point, it seems probable that here he has in view the original text of the argument of the Platonists as recorded by Nemesius, and obviously forgets that he had just reproduced it in a different form. Once more he only points out that the rule does not apply to the soul, and neglects mentioning his conclusion that this is fatal to the rule.

3. *si ... aliquo*: the second argument is not free from sophisms either. "It is proper to a body to be moved from the outside; now the soul is moved from the outside, so it is a body". Here Tert. adopts an assertion forming part of the syllogism just confuted, but mutilates it by writing *si corporis est* instead of *si inanimalis corporis est*, as otherwise he would have arrived at an impossible conclusion ("the soul is an inanimate body", cf. § 2: *Non ... potest anima animale corpus dici aut inanimale*). — *supra*: this does not refer to a lost passage from this treatise, as is supposed by Kroymann (*Quaest. Tert.*, 102), but to *De censu animae* (see Introduction, p. 13*). So both premisses of this argument should be ascribed to Tert. himself. — *cum vaticinatur*: the same passage from *De censu animae* is referred to in 22, 1: *Dedimus ... illi (sc. animae) ... divinationem interdum*. — *secundum exempli propositionem*: "in accordance with the major premiss" (for this sense of *propositio*, see Cic. *de inv.* 1, 36, 65/37, 67 and Kroll's note on Cic. *Brutus* 41, 152): if the soul is moved from the outside, it must be a body, for *corporis est moveri extrinsecus ab aliquo*. — *agnoseam* (Gel.), not *adagnoscam* (B) is the correct reading: firstly, it is supported by the clausula (1 γ), and secondly, Tert. seems to avoid double compounds of *nosco* (in *adv. Marc.* the cod. Montepesulanus contains forms of *adagnosco* in four places (4, 15 = 464, 8; 4, 20 = 486, 1; 4, 21 = 490, 14; 5, 5 = 586, 14); in all these cases we should adopt forms of *agnosco*, see Oehler on *adv. Marc.* 4, 20, Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 88/9, and Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 86₃). Moreover, Tert. has a predilection for *agnosco* (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 114). — *Enimvero*: instead of this word Reifferscheid proposes to read *iam vero*, of course on the ground that here a new argument begins. Nevertheless, it seems possible to retain the reading given by B Gel, as this argument is fairly closely connected with the preceding one, the words *si ab alio moveri corporis est* being no more than a repetition of its major premiss. So the new demonstration is given as a continuation (or rather as a climax) of the former: "I shall acknowledge

for a body whatever is moved from the outside; nay, if it is proper to a body . . .'. A parallel is found in 32, 7: *si nulla ratione capax est* (sc. anima) *huiusmodi translationis in animalia . . .*, *numquid ergo demutabitur secundum qualitates generum . . .?* (the answer of course is: 'certainly not'; with this the argument is concluded. Then Tert. proceeds to a new syllogism, which, however, starts from the negation of the conclusion just attained and so is not entirely new): *Eni m- v e r o si demutationem capit*, etc. — *si ab alio . . . aliud?*: this remark, which is probably meant as an *argumentum a fortiori*, is just as senseless as the argument occurring in the minor premiss in § 1: *ut quae ipsa potius moveat corpus*. — Instead of *extrinsecus* Kroymann proposes to read *intrinsecus*, which as to the sense is excellent, and (as he himself also points out) is supported by the next sentence (*i n t u s agitante*). Yet it should be remembered that Tert., when using adverbs as adjectives, usually puts them before the substantive (or rather between a pronoun, a genit. or an adject., and the substantive), to emphasize their adjectival function. For *extrinsecus*, cf. *pall.* 1, 1: *pallii extrinsecus habitus*; *exh. cast.* 1, 8: *opus est fidei extrinsecus consilio*; *praescr.* 4, 7/8: *nominis Christiani extrinsecus superficies*; *adv. Val.* 18 (197, 14): *velut sigillario extrinsecus ductu*; *orat.* 25 (197, 14) (in *paen.* 12, 3: *dissiliunt . . . montes ignis intrinsecus fetu* (Ursin.) we ought rather to follow Borleffs in adopting the reading *feti* found in *cod. N*). Similarly, *intus* is placed before the subst. in *ad nat.* 1, 12, 8: *et habitum, quem placuit . . . intus cruci* (= τῷ ἐνδον σταυρῷ). In such passages as 1, 2: *anima tunc Socratis* or *spect.* 1 (1, 13): *tanta solacia extrinsecus oculorum vel aurium*, in which the adverb follows the subst., it stands between subst. and gen., and so these passages do not support Kroymann's interpretation either (in *ad nat.* 2, 5, 14: *in ista investigatione alicuius artificis intus et domini* the adverb also refers to *domini*). So it seems preferable to leave the text unaltered and to follow Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 21) in interpreting *extrinsecus foris* as a pleonasm; a parallel is found in *Cypr. ep.* 72, 1 (775, 10 H.; also *ib.* 73, 5. 18): *foris extra ecclesiam*. — **parent**: the choice of this verb instead of *apparere* is due to the clausula (1 β δ), as is often the case in Tert.'s works, e. g. *apol.* 35, 7: *praecordia insculpta parerent* (1 γ; Fuld.; *ap.* Vulg.; cf. Löfst., *Apol.*, 107/8); *res.* 14 (44, 1; 1 γ); *adv. Marc.* 4, 8 (439, 1; 2 β γ δ); 5, 13 (619, 19; 1 γ); *spect.* 8 (9, 24; 1 β δ). Otherwise the verb *parere*, which in late Latin is very frequent (see e. g. Löfst., *Per.*, 58/9; Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 12/3; Rönsch, *It.*², 374 *seqq.*; Hagendahl, *Ammian.*, 110; Svonn., *Pallad.*, 546₃ and *Compos. Luc.*, 64.131), is seldom used by Tert. — **impingi**: see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 133. — **effatum**: not a Tp (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 135), for it already occurs in *Sil. Ital.* 17, 340. — **sigillario motu**: 'by a puppet-movement'; this word is used as an adjective also in *adv. Val.* 18 (197, 13/5): *et velut sigillario extrinsecus ductu in omnem operationem movebatur*. Whereas usually the main stress is laid on the 'movement from the inside', viz. the motion of the puppets by means of the strings (so in the passage under discussion: *sigillario motu superficiem i n t u s agitante*), Tert. in *adv. Val.* 18 emphasizes the fact that eventually

the puppets are moved from the outside, viz. by the person who pulls the chief string; the same idea occurs, for instance, in *Hor. sat.* 2, 7, 82: *duceris ut nervis alienis mobile lignum*, and in *Pers. sat.* 5, 128/9: *te nihil inpellit nec quicquam extrinsecus intrat quod nervos agitet*. This image is used for the first time by Plato (*Leg.* 1, 644 E), who refers it to the affections: τόδε δὲ ἴσμεν, ὅτι ταῦτα τὰ πάθη ἐν ἡμῖν οἷον νεῦρα ἢ σμήρινθοί τινες ἐνοῦσαι σπῶσί τε ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀλλήλαις ἀνθέλκουσιν ἐναντία οὔσαι ἐπ' ἐναντίας πράξεις. Aristotle in *de motu animal.* 7 (701 b 1 *seqq.*) compares the movements of animals with those of automatic dolls (which were more complicated than puppets): ὥσπερ δὲ τὰ αὐτόματα κινεῖται μικρᾶς κινήσεως γινομένης, λυομένων τῶν ξύλων (see for this reading the note by A. S. L. Farquharson in the Oxford translation) καὶ κρουόντων ἀλλήλαις τὰς στρέβλας ("the levers are released and strike the twisted strings against one another" F.) . . . , οὕτω καὶ τὰ ζῶα κινεῖται. ἔχει γὰρ ὄργανα τοιαῦτα τὴν τε τῶν νεύρων φύσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν ὀστέων, τὰ μὲν (sc. τὰ ὀστᾶ) ὥς ἐκεῖ τὰ ξύλα . . . , τὰ δὲ νεῦρα ὥς αἱ στρέβλαι · ὧν συστελλομένων (Farquharson; λυομένων M S S) καὶ ἀνιεμένων κινουῦνται. Of a very different nature is the discussion found in *de gener. animal.* 2, 1 (734 b 10 *seqq.*), where the transmission of the movement passing from the sperm of the father to the parts of the embryo developing from the sperm is compared to the transmission of movement in the αὐτόματα τῶν θαυμάτων; cf. also Galen *de usu part.* (III, 48. 262 Kühn). In this connection the affections are referred to in numerous passages from M. Aurel., e. g. 6, 16: τὸ νευροσπαστεῖσθαι καθ' ὁρμήν; 2, 2; 3, 16; 6, 28; (7, 3); 7, 29; 12, 19 (more like the passage under consideration is 10, 38: μέμνησο, ὅτι τὸ νευροσπαστοῦν ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔνδον ἐγκεχυμένον · ἐκεῖνο ῥήτορεῖα, ἐκεῖνο ζώή, ἐκεῖνο, εἰ δεῖ εἰπεῖν, ἀνθρώπος); the same is found in Simplic. *ad Epictet. enchir.* 1, 1 (Epict., ed. Schweighäuser, V, p. 18); Clem. *Alex. Strom.* 2, 3, 11, 1 and 4, 11, 79, 1; Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 6, 6 (245 A). A different conception is found in the works of Philo, who frequently qualifies the mind (or the ἡγεμονικόν) as τὸ νευροσπαστοῦν, e. g. *de opif. mundi* 117: ἀδὴ πάντα (viz. the five senses, τὸ φωνητήριον ὄργανον, and τὸ γόνιμον) καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς θαύμασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ νευροσπαστούμενα τοτὲ μὲν ἡρεμεῖ τοτὲ δὲ κινεῖται τὰς ἀρμοστούσας σχέσεις καὶ κινήσεις ἕκαστον; *de fuga et inv.* 46: γινῶθι . . . τίς ὁ τὰ θαύματα κινῶν καὶ νευροσπαστῶν ἀόρατος ἀοράτως, εἴτε ὁ ἐν σοὶ νοῦς εἴτε ὁ τῶν συμπάντων; *Quaest. et solut. in Genes.* 3, 48 (p. 222 Aucher): *nos autem tamquam miracula* (= θαύματα) *nervis corroboramur ad id, quod ad nos attinet, semen et generationem*; *de Abrah.* 73. It is highly probable that Philo borrowed this conception from the Stoics (see comm. on 14,4, where a similar image is used, viz. the *organum hydraulicum*); the same holds good of [Arist.] *de mundo* 6 (398 b 16 *seqq.*; Apul. *de mundo* 27 = 164, 2/11 Thom.), where God is represented as νευροσπαστῶν τὸν κόσμον (cf. the passage just quoted from Philo *de fuga et inv.* 46: εἴτε ὁ τῶν συμπάντων, sc. νοῦς). — *Unde . . . animae?*: instead of the genit. we should expect a dat., which also occurs in the next sentence. This use is fairly frequent

in Tert. (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 8/10, 31/3; 3, 22; 4, 76 *seqq.*). For further particulars, see Löfst., *Per.*, 273; Eran. 7 (1907), 63; *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 7 *seqq.*; *Synt.*, 1, 168/72; *Arnob.*, 100/1; Sjögren, *Tull.*, 132; Kroll, *Hermes* 62 (1927), 382₁ and note on *Cic. orat.* 16; Svern., *Pallad.*, 220/1; Blomgren, *Fortun.*, 1, 1/14 and *Sil.*, 63; Wahlén, 126/7; Haag, 901/2; Sörbom, 77/8; Stangl, *Pseudoascon.*, 63 and 121/2; Schepss, *A. L. L.* 3, 318; Pettersson, *Liv.*, 162₂; Lindgren, 71 *seqq.*; Wiman, *Arnob.*, 64/5; Mossberg, 19; Kalén, 43/8; Wistrand, 88/9; Norberg, 2, 146/8; Erikson, 30/2; Väanänen, 200; see also the notes on 5, 1 and *carm. de resurr. mort.* 101. From Tert.'s works two curious passages may be added, viz. *adv. Iud.* 2, 66: *nec adimamus hanc dei potestatem* and *ib.* 1. 75/6: (deus Adam) *incircumcisum colonum paradisi praejecit* (*paradisi* P N F R; *paradiso* T Kroym.).

4. The original form of the argument combated in the present passage has not been preserved; at any rate, it derives from *Phaedo* 79 A: οὐκοῦν τούτων μὲν (sc. τῶν πολλῶν καλῶν, οἷον ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἵππων ἢ ἱματίων, etc.) καὶ ἄψαιιο, καὶ ἴδοις, καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις αἰσθήσεσιν αἰσθοιο, τῶν δὲ κατὰ ταῦτὰ ἐχόντων οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅτω ποτ' ἂν ἄλλω ἐπιλάβοιο ἢ τῷ τῆς διανοίας λογισμῷ, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀειδῆ τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ οὐχ ὁρατά; The διανοίας λογισμός is rendered here by *sensus intellectuales*, just as in 18, 5 the *intellectuales* (or rather *spiritaes*) *vires* postulated by the Valentinians (who by Tert. are considered as fervent Platonists) are represented as forming part of the *sensus*; this confusion is due to the fact that Tert. is extremely afraid of separating sense-perception and mental activity (see preface to ch. 18), and so is inclined to represent human reason as a '*sensus secundus*'. — *ut tactui, ut visui*: for the use of the biarticulate asyndeton in Tert., see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 19/21; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 48₁; for further details, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 846/7; Lindgren, *Stud. Curt.*, 26 and 93/4 (with literature). For the *dat. auctoris*, see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 8/9 and *Synt.*, 25/6. — *conveniri* = *percipi, comprehendere*. The use of this verb with the cognate sense of '*deprehendere, nancisci, invenire*' is peculiar to Tert., e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 17 (358, 23): *conveneris . . . invenies*; *adv. Herm.* 45 (175, 10/1): *magis apparere coepit et ubique conveniri deus*; *res.* 12 (41, 17); *an.* 18, 5: *quae sensu conveniantur*. See Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 125 and *Thes.* 1. L. IV: 829, 63/75 (where, however, not all passages quoted really show this meaning). — *constat*: it is fairly surprising that an indicative is used in this conclusion, for Tert. does not agree with it (see comm. on § 1).

5. *Plane* is used ironically and so is equivalent to *sane*; cf. Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 87; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 48; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 112; Blokhuis, 112/3; see also the note on 2, 1. — *huius definitionis*: just as in § 2, *definitio* denotes the syllogism. For the use of the genit., see the note on § 3: *Unde . . . animae?* — *gradum*: cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 206/8 and *Thes.* 1. L. VI, 2: 2146, 40 *seqq.* — *Ecce enim* is frequently used by Tert. at the beginning of a sentence (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 85). — *sonum auditui*, etc.: this statement, viz. that sounds are incorporeal,

probably does not represent Tert.'s own view (according to the Stoics, the *φωνή* is a *σῶμα*; see Aët. 4, 20, 2, who *ib.* § 1 mentions Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras as adherents of the opposite view), but is exclusively due to the context. Tert. has to refute the following syllogism: "1. *corporalia corporalibus sensibus renuntiantur, incorporalia intellectualibus*. 2. *anima intellectualibus sensibus renuntiatur*. 3. *ergo anima incorporealis est*". Since he is sure that the minor premiss is right, his attack must be directed against the major. The negation of the second part of this premiss being the *demonstrandum*, he is forced to begin with the negation of its first part, i. e., he must declare objects perceived by the senses of the body to be incorporeal. This gives the following syllogism: "1. *incorporalia corporalibus sensibus renuntiantur, ergo et corporalia intellectualibus sensibus renuntiari possunt*. 2. *anima intellectualibus sensibus renuntiatur*. 3. *ergo anima corporalis esse potest*". — *quorum exemplo . . . accedit*: having reached this point Tert. fears the following objection: "*incorporalia, velut sonus, corporalibus sensibus, velut auditui, ideo renuntiantur, quia corporalibus (id est corpori humano) accedunt*". To this he replies: "*anima, quae incorporalibus sensibus renuntiatur, aequè corpori accedit*", in other words: "there is no reason to add a special cause (*quia corporalibus accedunt*) to the statement: *incorporalia corporalibus sensibus renuntiantur*, for this '*accessio corpori*' also applies to the soul, which is perceived by incorporeal senses; so the major premiss of my syllogism may be left unaltered". The sophism of course consists in the twofold use of *accedere*, which ambiguity is purposely concealed by the words *quorum exemplo*: the objects are 'conveyed' to the bodies <containing the souls> by means of the senses, whereas the soul is an *accidens* (*accedens*) of the body (see comm. on § 2); both conceptions are expressed by means of *accedere*. Tert. considers the verbs *accidere* and *accedere* to be equivalent; this is shown both by his use of the subst. *accessio* (see comm. on 25, 4) and by such passages as 11, 4: *accidentiam spiritus passus est* (viz. Adam in his ecstasy) ~ 10, 7: *animae humanae spiritum accedere* and 45, 3: *ecstasis animae accessit*; cf. also 16, 1; 47, 4; 51, 5; 52, 2, and the note on 20, 4. — *ne dicas*: we may say that *ne* is used instead of *ut non*, as the meaning is chiefly consecutive, though the final sense is still perceptible: "<which I assert,> lest you should say . . ."; the same use of *ne* is found in 16, 7 (*ne timeas*); 57, 9, *adv. Marc.* 2, 12 (352, 6), and 3, 19 (409, 4/5) (*ne putes*); *ib.* 4, 28 (516, 17) and 4, 33 (530, 10) (*ne quis existimet*); *ib.* 4, 40 (559, 11) (*ne dicerem*); *ad nat.* 2, 10, 12 (*ne . . . putetis*); for some other instances not to be explained in this way, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 82 (we may add *apol.* 8, 9 and 21, 16). According to Hofm., *Synt.*, 762, this use is not found in explicitly consecutive clauses before Tac. (e. g. *ann.* 2, 29 and 14, 7), whereas earlier instances are to be interpreted as 'rhetorical final clauses', e. g. Liv. 8, 10, 10: *Decii corpus ne eo die inveniretur, nox quaerentes oppressit* (see Seyffert-Müller, *Cic. Lael.*, p. 231, and Kühn-Stegm., 2, 251); however, the first-mentioned use seems to occur somewhat earlier, for instance in Cels. (3, 14: *sic enim fore, ne*; see Brolén, 38) and Colum. (Svenn., *Pallad.*, 513 and Dahllöf, 73).

For the later period, see Thörn., *Paneg.*, 14/5; Stix, 9/10; Konjetzny, 349/50; Lilliedahl, 75 *seqq.*; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 117; Lyngby, 30; Hartel, A. L. L. 3, 26; Linde, 40; Pauly, index to Salvianus, p. 346. — *sit*: the use of the 'modest' potential subjunctive is of course ironical; perhaps we may compare *ad nat.* 1, 9, 9: *ne* ('certainly') *deos vestros iniustissimos pronuntietis* (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 11; *ne<cesse est>* Borleffs).

6. *quod . . . studiis*: this syllogism harks back to Xenocrates; cf. Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 2: Ἐτι ἡ ψυχὴ, εἰ μὲν τρέφεται, ὑπ' ἄσωμάτου τρέφεται · τὰ γὰρ μαθήματα τρέφει αὐτήν · οὐδὲν δὲ σῶμα ὑπ' ἄσωμάτου τρέφεται · οὐκ ἄρα σῶμα ἡ ψυχὴ. Ξενοκράτης οὕτω συνήγεν. εἰ δὲ μὴ τρέφεται, πᾶν δὲ σῶμα ζώου τρέφεται, οὐ σῶμα ἡ ψυχὴ. — *sapientiae . . . studiis*: *Phaedo* 84 A: (ψυχὴ ἀνδρὸς φιλοσόφου) τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὸ ἀδόξαστον θεωμένη καὶ ὑπ' ἐκείνου τρεφομένη (cf. *Phaedr.* 247 D). In the philosophy of the later period and in Christian literature this idea is a very common one, e. g. Philo *leg. allegor.* 3, 161. 176; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 7, 12, 72, 4; Lactant. *div. instit.* 2, 12, 14; 3, 13, 16; Claud. Mam. *de stat. anim.* 2, 9. — *methodicae*: Tp; see Introduction, pp. 23*/5*. — *respondente*: 'gives the advice' as *medicinae peritus*, just as the *iuris periti*; cf. 26, 1. — *animam . . . ali*: this view is not alien to a physician, who moreover was an adherent of the Stoics. Tert. here follows Soranus, whereas in 38, 5/6 he argues that the soul only needs food on account of its being *inquilinus carnis*. — *fulciri* is found in this context from Lucr. 2, 1147 downwards; see Munro's note on that passage and Thes. I. L. VI: 1505, 75 *seqq.*; cf. also res. 61 (122, 27): *victus fulcimenta*, and Arnob. 7, 17. — *Quidni?*: followed by a relative clause this word is found from Catull. (see Kroll's note on 79, 1) and Cic. (Hofm., *Synt.*, 646) downwards; for Tert., see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 10 and Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 31/2. — *in totum*, which occurs from Cels. downwards (see Wölfflin, A. L. L. 4, 146), is very frequent in Tert. (Waltz., *Ét.*, 232; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 100/1). — *plenissime . . . expertus*: see Introduction, pp. 26* *seqq.* — *Non enim omnium est*: cf. *pall.* 3, 5: *sed arcana ista, nec omnium nosse*.

7. *philosophus* here means 'Plato' (mark the contrast: *Soranus . . . philosophus*); the same is found in ch. 4: *depulsa est philosophi opinio* (see comm.). — *cunctanti de exitu*: as far as I know, no exact parallels to this use of *cunctari de exist* (such passages as Tac. *hist.* 3, 50, *de summa rerum cunctantes*, are different). — *mulsam aquam*: cf. 31, 6: (Plato) *quem forsitan Nestorem credidissemus ob mella facundiae* (probably Tert. has in view the legend that (Cic. *div.* 1, 78) *in cunis parvulo dormienti apes in labellis consedisent*). The choice of *mulsam aqua* instead of *mel* in this passage is due to the fact that *mulsam* was the common food for babies or very weak people (cf. e. g. Muscio 1, 85 = 31, 1/2 Rose). For this estimation of Plato, cf. also Max. Tyr. 11, 1: ὁ εὐφρονότατος τῶν ὄντων Πλάτων. — *micas*: Oribasius (*Synops.* 9, 48) mentions *cibos alicae lota in mulsam aut micam panis* as a particularly soft food; the choice of *minutuloquium* is of

course also due to this consideration, cf. e. g. Aug. *de catech. rud.* 10, 15: *minuta mansa inspuere parvulo filio*. Combined with a sentence from § 8 this passage was imitated by Fulgent., *Mitol. praef.* (15, 4/6 Helm): *Carneadis . . . elleborum et Platonis auratum eloquium et Aristotelis syllogisticum brevilloquium*. — *de eloquio Platonis*: Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 52) is certainly wrong in asserting that *de* in this passage is almost equivalent to *secundum*, for, according to Tert., the *mulsa aqua* was drawn in the literal sense of the word from the *mella facundiae*, just as the *micae* are fragments of the *minutilloquium*. — *minutilloquio*: words ending in *-loquium* belong to colloquial Latin and are avoided in prose of the classical period (for instance cf. Quint. *instit.* 1, 6, 28: '*verilloquium*' *ipse Cicero qui finxit, reformidat*); for a survey of these words, see Cooper, 302 seqq.; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 134 and 168. *minutilloquium* is Tp, just as *malilloquium* (*apol.* 45, 3), and *turpilloquium* (*prud.* 17 = 258, 21); *risilloquium* (*paen.* 10, 4) and *spurcilloquium* (*res.* 4 = 31, 2) are ἀπαξ εἰρημένα; a subst. *subtililoquentia* is found in Tert. only (*adv. Marc.* 5, 19 = 645, 4. 10. 23; *Iren. lat.* 3, 14, 4 has *subtililloquium*). For the many words ending in *-loquium* found in the Latin translation of Irenaeus, see Rönsch, *It.*², 216/23. In a completely similar context *minutilloquium* is used in Iren. 2, 18, 4: *et minutilloquium, et subtilitatem circa quaestiones, cum sit Aristotelicum, inferre fidei conantur*. This word of course serves as a translation for μικρολογία (which Aristotle himself regarded as an indispensable requirement of scientific method, cf. e. g. *metaphys.* A ἐλάττ., 3 (995 a 8/10): καὶ οἱ μὲν πάντα ἀκριβῶς, τοὺς δὲ λυπεῖ τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἢ διὰ τὸ μὴ δυνάσθαι συνεῖπειν ἢ διὰ τὴν μικρολογίαν). For Christian authors, who in general are completely ignorant of the contents of Aristotle's writings, the *Organon* excepted, and usually describe him as a cavilling dialectician (see my article 'Aristoteles', R A C 1, 657/64), this μικρολογία is his most outstanding characteristic; cf. e. g. Tert. *praescr.* 7, 18 seqq.: *Aristotelen qui illis dialecticam instituit, artificem struendi et destruendi, versipellem in sententiis, coactam in coniecturis, duram in argumentis*, etc.; Hier. *adv. Helvid.* 2: *A.-is spineta*; Gregor. Nazianz. *orat.* 27, 10: 'Α-ους τὴν μικρόλογον προνοίαν; Prud. *apoth.* 201/2: *quos texit A.-es torta vertigine nervos*; for further details, see the article just quoted. — *infern*: obviously the construction with a dat. and accus. is due to the preceding *infudit*; usually an accus. and an instrumental ablat. are attached to this verb, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 3, 10 (392, 14): (*carnem*) *stercoribus inferens*; *pall.* 4, 3; [Lactant.] *mort. persec.* 49, 3: *se cibo inf.*; Arnob. 7, 29. A different construction is found in Colum. 12, 53: *in eas partes . . . largum salem infercito*. — *Quid autem . . . vivunt?*: a new argument, taken from the guiding principle of the treatise *De testimonio animae*; cf. especially 1 (135, 20/2): *sed non eam te* (sc. anima) *advoco quae scholis formata, bibliothecis exercitata, aca* *de* *mi* *is et porticibus Atticis pasta sapientiam ructas*. The importance of the testimony of uneducated people is frequently emphasized in Christian apologetics: Tert. *apol.* 46, 9; Justin *apol.* 2, 10, 8 (1, 60, 11); Tatian. *orat.* 32/3; Athenag. *legat.* 11; Min. Fel. 16, 5/6; Lactant. *div. instit.* 5, 19, 14; 6, 4, 11; Aug. *civ. dei* 10, 11.

These expositions were primarily influenced by Matth. 11, 25 (Luc. 10, 21). For the estimation of the 'barbarians', cf. 31, 6; Tatian. *orat.* 1 (Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 154; Achelis, 1, 247). For the antithesis of Christianity and philosophy in this form, cf. *adv. Hermog.* 1 (127, 4/5): *a Christianis . . . ad philosophos conversus, de ecclesia in academiam et porticum; praescr.* 7, 33 seqq.: *Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae? . . . Nostra institutio de porticu Solomonis est . . . Viderint qui Stoicum et Platicum et dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt.* — **tot ac tantae**: *tantae* here is synonymous with *tot* (see comm. on 9, 6), the same pleonasm (for which see Waltz., *Ét.*, 188) being found in *apol.* 10, 5. — **rupicum**: an archaism (Lucil. 1121 Marx) reintroduced by Gellius (13, 9, 5), which also occurs in *apol.* 21, 30 and *pall.* 4, 2; *rupico* is used by Apul. *flor.* 7 (9,20 Helm). — **quibus . . . desunt et tamen . . . pollent**: for the omission of the relative pronoun before *pollent*, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 714 (isolated instances of this omission, at least as far as the nom. and accus. are concerned, are found in all periods of the Latin language). — **indoctae prudentia**: the reading given by A (*indoctae*) may be retained, if we understand οἷσαι (see comm. on 5, 4), and interpret these words as being equivalent to a subordinate clause with concessive meaning (Gomperz, *Tert.*, 63/4). Yet, if we do so, we should expect the addition of *licet* (cf. e. g. 27, 8); moreover, the ending *-ae* may be due to the preceding *sapientiae*, so that the choice is rather difficult. The reading *indoctae* may find support in the fact that *prudentia*, which (as opposed to *sapientiae*) has the main stress, is better left without an adjunct: the combination *prudentia pollent* speaks for itself. — **carceribus Soeratis**: which, according to Tert., is the birth-place of all pagan wisdom concerning the soul (ch. 1). — **ieiunantes a philosophia**: Tert. seems to be the first author to attach the preposition *a(b)* to *ieiunare*, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 3, 7 (388, 11 = *adv. Iud.* 14, 72): *ieiunantibus ceteris a salute* (PNFR; *ad salutem* T Kroym.); *puđ.* 16 (254, 5/6; in *bapt.* 20, 3: *et nos . . . a lavacro potius ieiunare oportet* the words *a lavacro* are equivalent to *post lavacrum*); for passages from later authors (only Christians), see Thes. 1. L. VII: 250, 33/44 (we may add Paulin. Nol. *ep.* 44, 7 (378, 21/2 Hartel) and Aug. c. *Iulian. Pelag.* 1, 7, 32). The combination *ieiunus a* also occurs in Christian literature only (Thes., *loc. cit.*, 252, 34/43 and besides, in Ennod. *ep.* 9, 6 (232, 12/3 Hartel); *ieiunium a* is found in Aug. *de Gen. c. Manich.* 2, 31). This idiom is almost certainly a Grecism (ἀγνεύειν, νηστεύειν, καθαρίζεσθαι ἀπό; for instances, see Arbesmann, *Das Fasten*, 6, 9/10, 14 and W. Kuhring, *De praeposit. Graec. in chartis Aeg. Ptolem. aet. usu quaest. sel.* (Bonn 1906), 52 seqq.; Blass-Debrunner, 85 (§ 182). — **Bene . . . quod**: this expression, which is frequently found from Cic. downwards, occurs 34 times in Tert.'s works (Thes. 1. L. II: 2122, 60 seqq.). — **quod . . . affirmant**: cf. Sen. *ep.* 117, 2: *sapientiam bonum esse dicunt* (sc. Stoici): *sequitur, ut necesse sit illam corporalem quoque dicere*. According to the Stoics, the arts are also ἔξεις of the corporeal soul and so are corporeal themselves; cf. Plut. *de commun. not.* 45 (1084 A = *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 848): ἀτοπον γὰρ εἶ μάλα τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰς κακίας, πρὸς

δὲ ταύταις τὰς τέχνας . . . σώματα ποιουμένους (sc. τοὺς Στωϊκοὺς) ἐν μηδὲν φάναι κείσθαι. This view is combated by Alex. Aphrodis. *de anim. libri mantissa* p. 116, 13 Bruns (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 797): ἔτι εἰ καὶ αἱ ἀρεταὶ σώματα καὶ αἱ τέχναι, πῶς οὐ προσγεγόμενα ταῦτά τινι στενοχωρήσει τὸ σῶμα ἢ αὐξήσει; cf. also *St. V. F.* 3, frag. 84, Rauch, 31/2, and Stier, 31 *seqq.* It is not necessary that Tert. really should have shared this view of the Stoics; his way of recording it rather suggests that he regarded it as a curiosity (which, however, in this context was quite useful); at all events, in *adv. Hermog.* 36 he explicitly declares motion to be incorporeal, as it is not a *substantiva res* . . . , *quia nec corporalis, sed accidens, si forte, substantiae et corpori* (166, 1/2; *ib.*, l. 11/2 the same is said with regard to *actus, passiones, officia*, and *libidines*). Alex. Aphrodis. (*op. cit.*, p. 122, 16 Bruns), Albinus (Ἐπτ. 11), and Plotinus (4, 7, 8¹) connect the demonstration of the incorporeality of qualities with the demonstration of the incorporeality of the soul. — *sic (quoque)* . . . *si*, (καὶ) οὕτως . . . εἰ ('also in the event of . . .'), is found from Cic. *ep. ad Att.* 12, 38, 2 downwards (Anton. *ib.* 14, 13 A, 2); see Hofm., *Synt.*, 772, and for the use of *sic quoque* in Tert., Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 28.

8. *enormis intentio philosophiae*: as is shown by the sequel, *philosophia* (almost equivalent to 'Platonic philosophy'; see comm. on 4, *depulsa est philosophi opinio*) is the logical subject; for *enormis*, cf. 58, 9. — *pro pedibus* = *ea quae pro pedibus sunt*, τὰ πρὸ ποδῶν (cf. Min. Fel. 12, 7: *satis est pro pedibus aspicere*); cf. Löfst., *Arnob.*, 42 and Eran. 10 (1910), 161 *seqq.* — *sic Thales in puteum*: the same story is told in *ad nat.* 2, 4, 18: *merito ergo Milesius Thales, dum totum caelum examinat et ambulat oculis, in puteum cecidit turpiter, multum inrisus Aegyptio illi*: 'in terra', inquit, 'nihil perspicuens caelum tibi speculandum existimas?' For the source of the mentioning of an Egyptian in this context, see Borleffs, *De Tert. et Min. Fel.*, 43, who has also collected the passages where this story (frequently mentioned from Plato *Theaet.* 174 A downwards) is recorded (we may add Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 1, 4); cf. also Vahlen's note on Enn. *scen.* 244, Weyman, A. L. L. 8, 34. 408, and Norden, *Neue Jahrb. Suppl.* 18 (1892), 270. — *valetudinis corruptelam*: cf. *valetudinis labe*, 44, 2; *vitio valetudinis, pud.* 21 (270, 19); *res.* 57 (117, 9); *adv. Marc.* 4, 20 (487, 13). *valetudo* in *de an.* means 'health' (this passage and 44, 2; *bona v.* 28, 4 and 45, 5), 'state of health' (20, 4; 24, 4. 9; 43, 7; 48, 1), or 'disease' (17, 9; 25, 3. 4; 32, 5; 43, 8). — *Chrysippus ad elleborum*: Lucian. *Hermotim.* 86: οὐκ ἂν ὠκνησα καὶ ἐλλέβορον πιεῖν διὰ τοῦτο ἐς τὸ ἐμπαλιν ἢ ὁ Χρυσίππος, ὅπως μὴδὲν ἔτι νόησαιμι ὦν φασι, and *verae narrat.* 2, 18: ἡκούομεν δὲ καὶ περὶ Χρυσίππου ὅτι οὐ πρότερον αὐτῷ ἐπιβῆναι τῆς νήσου θέμις, πρὶν τὸ τέταρτον ἑαυτὸν ἐλλεβορίσῃ. These allusions are explained by Petron. 88, 4: *Chrysippus ut ad inventionem sufficeret, ter helleboro animum detergit*; cf. also Hier. *ad Galat.* 1, 15: *ut non absque sudore et Chrysippi eis possit helleboro responderi*; Fulgent. *Vergil. contin.* p. 85, 2 Helm: *Chrysippi ellebori rancidulo acrore postposito*. Since the story concerning Thales is also

frequently mentioned by Lucian (see Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, 43₂; 88₁; 280₂), it is highly probable that Tert. has drawn both stories from a Cynic source (for Thales, see Norden, *loc. cit.*). The present story is mostly associated with Carneades (Plin. *n. h.* 25, 51; Val. Max. 8, 7 ext. 5; Gell. 17, 15, 1; Martian. Cap. 4, 327, vs. 17; Fulgent. *Mitolog. praef.* p. 15, 4/5 Helm); cf. also Varro *sat. Menipp.* 484: *alteram viam deformasse Carneadem virtutis e cupis acris aceti* (probably imitated by Pers. 5, 86: *Stoicus . . . aurem mordaci lotus aceto*). Auson. *ep.* 14, 69/70 mentions Pythagoras in this context. For further particulars about the effect of helleborus, cf. Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 208 and *St. V. F.* 1, frag. 394 (Stob. *ecl.* II: 24, 12 Wachsm.: Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὁμοιωμάτων): ὁ ἑλλέβορος ὁλοσχερέστερος μὲν ληφθεὶς καθαίρει, εἰς δὲ πᾶν συμικρὰ τριφθεὶς πνίγει· οὕτω καὶ ἡ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λεπτολογία. — *cum . . . negavit*: d'Alès, *Theol.*, 116₁, takes *Chrysippus* as the subject of *negavit* and remarks: "Assertion fort surprenante, car Chrysippe ne niait point, tant s'en faut, la compénétration des corps . . . Tertullien a vraisemblablement en vue l'opinion stoïcienne mentionnée *An.* 25, laquelle contestait l'animation du fœtus dans le sein maternel". Against this interpretation two arguments may be advanced. Firstly, it is very improbable that *Chrysippus* should be added mentally to *negavit*: both Thales and Chrysippus have only been mentioned in passing for the purpose of instancing the foolishness of pagan philosophy; then Tert. returns to philosophy in general (by which, however, he means Platonism in the first place): *ei* does not refer to *Chrysippus*, who is no longer important here, but to *enormis intentio philosophiae* (= *philosophia enormi intentione praedita*). d'Alès has been led astray by Junius' conjecture *alienato*, which was adopted by Reifferscheid; the reading *alienata* found in A is quite satisfactory. Secondly, if we were to follow d'Alès, the subsequent discussion would only serve as an illustration of the assertion that philosophy *solet plerumque nec prospicere pro pedibus*, etc., which is a most unsatisfactory conclusion of this chapter. On the other hand, we get an excellent conclusion, if we assume that a fourth argument in favour of the incorporeality of the soul is refuted here, viz.: "1. two bodies cannot possibly be in one and the same place; 2. the soul is in the body; 3. so the soul is not a body". This reasoning would have been obvious, if Tert. had written: *cum duo in unum corpora eaque de causa animam corpus negavit*. Originally this argument was invented by Aristotle, *de anim.* 1, 5 (409 b 1/4; Aristotle is refuting such philosophers as declare the soul to be σώμα τι λεπτομερές): εἴπερ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν παντὶ τῷ αἰσθανομένῳ σώματι, ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δύο εἶναι σώματα ("which is impossible"; cf. e. g. *phys.* 4, 1 (209 a 6 *seqq.*); 4, 3 (210 b 19); *de anim.* 2, 7 = 418 b 17), εἰ σώμα τι ἡ ψυχὴ (cf. also Plotinus 4, 7, 8²). This view was contested by the Stoics, who presumed that two or more bodies can exist in one and the same place on account of a μῖξις δι' ὅλου (cf. e. g. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 469 (= Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 21, 5): σώματα δὲ πάντα ὑπέθεντο, καὶ σῶμα διὰ σώματος μὲν χωρεῖν . . . καὶ πεπληρῶσθαι πάντα καὶ μὴδὲν εἶναι κενόν); they assumed that this also held good for body and soul, cf. e. g. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 473

(155, 24 *seqq.* Arn.); *ib.* 467: σώματα γὰρ πάντα λέγειν δοκοῦντες, καὶ τὰς ποιότητας καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ διὰ παντὸς ὄρωντες τοῦ σώματος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν χωροῦσαν καὶ τὰς ποιότητας, ἐν ταῖς κράσεσι συνεχώρουν σῶμα διὰ σώματος χωρεῖν; 471 (153, 10/2 Arn.); 797; 1, frag. 145. The growth of living beings through nourishment was regarded as a strong argument in favour of this theory (it is refuted by Alex. Aphrodis. *de mixt.* p. 233, 14 Bruns = *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 735). It is not improbable that, besides the text of the argument, Tert. also took the refutation from Soranus, who was strongly influenced by the Stoics and moreover seems to have had a predilection for highly concrete arguments, as is shown by the instances given in § 6 and in 8,3. — Instead of *in unum* we should expect *in uno*; however, *in unum* at this time had become a standing expression, which frequently took the place of *in uno* (an early instance is found in Martial. 7, 82, 3: *nam saepe lavamur in unum*); cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 98/101; *Verm. Stud.*, 204/5; Rönsch, *Sem.* 2,73; Tidn., *Eran.* 25 (1927), 66 and *Did.*, 161; Svernn., *Pallad.*, 316. *In uno* instead of *in unum* (from Sen. downwards: *benef.* 5, 10, 1: *in uno coeunt*) occurs in 27, 8: *in uno miscuerunt*; see Weyman, *Christl.-Lat. Poesie*, 184 and Ahlberg, 9. — *prospectu* followed by a genit. (also *adv. Marc.* 5, 13 = 621, 22) is found from Val. Max. and Gell. downwards. *Recogitatus* is found in Tert. only; with an object. genit. it also occurs in *iei.* 7 (283, 16); *ib.* 9 (284, 26); *apol.* 22, 7 (Fuld.; see Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 61); *adv. Marc.* 4, 43 (566, 2); *pall.* 6, 1. — *Invenitur*, etc.: as has already been pointed out by several scholars (Vitton, 27; Geiselhart, 10; Beck, 115), this passage furnishes an important argument in favour of the view that Tert. is identical with the lawyer mentioned in the *Digesta* (cf., however, Schlossman, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte* 27 (1906), 268₃). We must start our discussion at *dig.* 46, 3, 36 (Julianus): *nam et Aristoteles (hist. anim.* 7, 4 = 584 b 33 *seqq.*) *scripsit quinque nasci posse, quia vulvae mulierum totidem receptacula habere possunt; et esse mulierem Romae Alexandrinam ab Aegypto, quae quinque simul peperit et tum habebat incolumes, et hoc et in Aegypto adfirmatum est mihi.* This passage is referred to in *dig.* 29, 2, 30, 6 (Ulpianus libro octavo ad Sabinum): *quod et Sextum Pomponium opinatum Tertullianus libro quarto quaestionum refert: putasse enim, sicuti cum vacuo utero suus ex asse heres est, ita et cum unum gerit nec per naturam humanae condicionis alium partum formare potest (quod quidem post certum tempus conceptionis eveniet), ex parte dimidia et ignorantem fore heredem, non ex quarta, ut Iulianus putat* (viz. in the sentence immediately preceding the passage just quoted). The same case is mentioned in *dig.* 34, 5, 7 pr. (Gaius libro primo fideicommissorum): *et nostra quidem aetate Serapias Alexandrina mulier ad divum Hadrianum perducta est cum quinque liberis, quos uno fetu enixa est* (perhaps also *ib.* 5, 4, 3). Wissowa (Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, 4¹⁰, 4) supposes this to be the woman whose children, according to Phlegon of Tralles (*mirab.* 29), were educated at the expense of the emperor Trajanus. See also S H A Antonin. Pius 9, 3 and [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 115, 69. — *quinionem*: I follow A in putting a comma before

filiorum (though in 46, 11 we find a genit. after *quinio*), as in this case we, firstly, have a better clausula (1 γ) and, secondly, preserve the parallelism (3 groups of 4 words each). *Quinio* is mostly used to denote the five spots on a die, e.g. Isidor. *orig.* 18, 65; a different meaning is found in Iren. *lat.* 2, 19, 1: *octonatio . . . et non quinio, vel trinitas*, and 2, 36, 2: *nec quinionem quasi ut divinam rem aliquam consecramus*. — *fetus* here has the meaning of *partus*, which is frequently found in Plin. *n. h.* and the Jct (Thes. I. L. VI: 636, 40/58); from Tert. cf. *an.* 25, 8 and 32, 5; *res.* 60 (121, 7); in *res.* 45 (92, 6) this word even means 'conception'. — *unici uteri*: for the genit., cf. Priscillian. *tract.* 10 (98, 2 Schepss): *Rebecca, felicis mater uteri*. — *uteri*: this word, too, is almost equivalent to *partus* (the lawyers often write *uno utero eniti*, just as in *dig.* 34, 5, 7 we find *uno fetu enixa est*). — *populo*: cf. Ovid *met.* 6, 198: *populo natorum . . . meorum* (Niobe); *ib.* 11, 633: *e populo natorum mille suorum* (here, however, Ovid refers to *Odys.* 24, 12: δῆμον Ὀνείρων); Apul. *met.* 2, 8: *Venus . . . omni Gratiarum choro stipata et toto Cupidinum populo comitata*, and *apol.* 47 (54, 25): *XV liberi homines populus est*; see also Svonn., *Pallad.*, 76₇.

9. In the last paragraph Tert. combines the view that bodies may be present in other bodies with thoughts uttered in a totally different context, viz. the discussion of the Trinity. With the sentence *Secundum sit necesse est quod ex alio est* may be compared *adv. Prax.* 8 (239, 4/6): *omne, quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit eius necesse est, de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum. secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt*; the following passages, though they do not furnish equally perfect parallels, belong to the same sphere of thought: *apol.* 21, 13: *ita de spiritu spiritus et de deo deus modulo alter numerum gradu non statu fecit*; *exh. cast.* 7, 7/8; *adv. Marc.* 1, 5 (296, 17/8); *adv. Prax.* 13 (248, 15/6 and 249, 4 *seqq.*). — *conditio*, κτίσις, 'creation'; for this meaning, which is found in Christian literature only, see Thes. I. L. IV: 145, 5/79; Teeuwen, 129; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 173; for Tert., see Waltz., *Ét.*, 474₃. — *quod ex alio est* (A) is the correct reading; the alteration found in B is due to the preceding *sit*. — *nisi, dum gignitur, duo sunt*: it is certainly wrong to follow B and Gel. in inserting *sed tunc* between *gignitur* and *duo*, for firstly, a sentence *Nihil . . . ex alio est, nisi dum gignitur* is completely senseless, and secondly, *gignitur duo sunt* gives an excellent clausula (1³; see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 60₁). — *dum gignitur*: 'during the genesis', cf. e.g. Varro *r. r.* 3, 9, 3: *usque dum rumpatur* 'h. e. dum ruptura fiat' Keil; Sen. *ep.* 1, 2: *dum differtur, vita transcurrit*; Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 4, 374: *dum confarreatur* ('during the *confarreatio*').

7. *The story of Lazarus and the rich man as an argument in favour of the corporeality of the soul.*

"Here we may conclude this discussion of the corporeality of the soul, because it is sufficient to the refutation of philosophers. For Christian readers it is already too long, for these may find a convincing proof in Holy Scripture, viz. the story of Lazarus and the rich man

(§ 1). However, it is said that this story should be interpreted allegorically. But if all this did not really happen, why then should the name of Lazarus have been mentioned? Besides, even if this story is no more than an *imago*, it nevertheless testifies to the reality on which it is founded; for it would be impossible to represent the soul metaphorically as a body, if it did not really possess a body, nor would Holy Scripture mention 'members of the soul', if these did not really exist (§ 2). Moreover, the soul is detained in hell, which would be impossible, if it were nothing; for it will be nothing, if it is not a body: whatever is incorporeal, cannot be detained, punished, or comforted, as I shall demonstrate in a more suitable place <, viz. in ch. 58> (§ 3). So, if the soul is punished or comforted in hell before the Last Judgment, it must be corporeal: incorporeal substances cannot undergo anything, as they have nothing by means of which they can undergo it; or if they have such a part, this will be a body. For whatever is corporeal, is capable of suffering, and whatever is capable of undergoing something, is corporeal (§ 4)".

The structure of the argument in §§ 2/4 is highly confused. In § 2 Tert. refutes the idea that the story of Lazarus should be no more than an *imago veritatis*, by advancing three arguments: a) "the fact that the name of Lazarus is mentioned guarantees the reality of the story"; b) "if the soul did not possess a body, it could not symbolically be represented by a body" (this is no more than the exaggeration of an idea familiar to Tert.; see comm. on § 2); c) immediately after, Tert. completely ignores the possibility of an *imago*, and argues that Holy Scripture would lie, if it mentioned 'members of the soul' that did not exist.

In § 3 the two following syllogisms have been mixed up: I. A. *Nihil incorporale detineri potest*. B. *Anima detinetur apud inferos*. C. *Ergo anima corporalis est*, and II. A. *Quod non corpus est, nihil est*. B. *Anima non nihil est*. C. *Ergo anima corpus est*. If Tert. had stuck to the first syllogism, he ought to have written: A. 1. *Quid est autem illud . . . patriarcharum, nisi anima?* 2. *Incorporalis autem . . . libera est*. <3. *Ergo anima corporalis est*> (in 1 the main stress is laid on *detinetur* and *reservatur*; in 2 *custodiae* refers to these words). In the second case the argument should have run as follows: B. 1. *Quid est autem illud . . . patriarcharum, nisi anima?* 2. <*Anima autem, si non corpus est, detineri non potest,*> nam (α) *si non corpus est, nihil est*, et (β) *si nihil est, detineri non potest*. <3. *Ergo anima corpus est*>. Instead of this Tert. writes down a syllogism with two major premisses: he begins with the minor one (A 1 = B 1); next he gives two premisses (B 2 β, B 2 α), the conclusion of which gives the second major premiss (B 2), which is not mentioned itself, and after this adds the major premiss of the first syllogism (A 2), which now has become quite superfluous. Since it is no longer possible to connect A 2 with the preceding assertion by *autem*, he writes *enim*; but this is not a good solution either, for the fact that nothing incorporeal can be detained, contains no motivation for the assertion that the soul, if it is not a body, is nothing at all (after *Nihil enim, si non corpus* the only

possible motivation would have been: *omne enim quod extat, corpus est*).

After mentioning the *custodia* Tert. proceeds to reflect on the nature of this *custodia*, which is made up of punishment or comfort. This leads him to a third syllogism, which had already been announced at the end of § 3 by the words: *incorporalitas enim . . . hoc erit corpus*, and which is given in § 4: C. 1. *Incorporalitas nihil patitur* (= § 3 *incorporalitas ab omni . . . fovella*). 2. *Anima punitur et fovetur* (= *patitur*) *apud inferos* (*si quid . . . in sinu Abrahae*). 3. *Ergo anima corporalis est*. In the conclusion the major premiss (C 1) is supported by a sophistic inversion of the thesis *omne corporale passibile est*.

The argument of this chapter (which is characterized both by the sophisms occurring in §§ 2 and 4 and by the confused syllogism in § 2) is so typical of Tert. that the problem of its sources may be confined to the question whence he got the idea of proving the corporeality of the soul by means of the story of Lazarus, and how he came to combat the view that this story should be no more than an *imago*.

With regard to the first question we may refer to *Exc. ex Theodoto* 14 (cf. C. Barth, 105): ἄντικρυς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λαζάρου καὶ τοῦ πλουσίου διὰ τῶν σωματικῶν μελῶν σῶμα εἶναι δείκνυται ἡ ψυχὴ; however, it is impossible that Tert. should have been influenced by this passage. On the other hand, it is very likely that he consulted Iren. 2, 55: *Plenissime autem Dominus docuit, non solum perseverare, non de corpore in corpus transgredientes animas, sed et characterem corporis, in quo etiam adaptantur, custodire eundem: et meminisse eas operum quae egerunt hic, et a quibus cessaverunt, in ea relatione quae scribitur de Divite et de Lazaro . . . in qua ait, Divitem cognoscere Lazarum post mortem, et Abraham autem similiter . . . Per haec enim manifestissime declaratum est, et perseverare animas, et non de corpore in corpus transire, et habere hominis figuram, ut etiam cognoscantur* (that the soul has the shape of the body, is also emphasized by Iren. in 2, 31, 1, whereas in 5, 7, 1 he says: *sed incorporeales animae, quantum ad comparisonem mortalium corporum* (thereupon Gen. 2, 7 is quoted): *flatus autem vitae incorporealis*; however, "this is only a qualified assertion of the incorporeity of the soul", as is rightly observed by Harvey). From a later period we may mention Faust. Rei. ep. 3 (177, 22 seqq. Engelbrecht): *dic, quaeso, si locales non sunt* (sc. animae), *quomodo peccatores a coetibus . . . iustorum . . . illud chaos . . . discriminat?* (according to Faustus (*de spir. sanct.* 2, 1 = 132, 14 seqq. Eng.), the soul is incorporeal, if compared with the *crassitudo exterioris hominis*, but corporeal, if compared to its creator; this view is refuted by Claudian. Mam. *de stat. anim.* 3, 3); Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 4, 16, 23 (in a polemic against Vincentius Victor): *Denique, inquis, membra illic animae describuntur, ut vere sit corpus; et vis, per oculum totum caput intelligi, quia dictus est levasse oculos suos, etc.; Method. resurr.* 3, 18 (cf. *ib.* 3, 2, 5/6), where this text is quoted as a proof for the theory that the souls are σώματα νοερά and εἰς λόγῳ θεωρητὰ μέλη διακεχώσμενται, ταύτην λαβοῦσαι τὴν διατύπωσιν τῆς μορφῆς (for this view, see also 3, 17, 3. 5 and 3, 18, 7). The influence of the chapter under consideration is found in [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 1 (7, 6 seqq. Batiffol-Wilmart):

et unde, rogo, homini mortuo et in terra sepulto os et lingua, qui apud inferos refrigerium roris de digito animae felicioris expeteret? Hic est ergo homo interior (cf. an. 9, 8), *quem apostolus secundum Deum creatum asserit esse.* However, the opposite view is much more frequently found. For instance, Gregor. Nyssen. (*de anim. et resurr.* 216 D *seqq.*) declares the whole story to be incomprehensible, εἰ μή τις μεταλάβοι τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον εἰς νοητὴν θεωρίαν; he also emphasizes the fact that the word ἄδης (Luc. 16, 23) does not denote a definite place, but τινὰ κατάστασιν ζωῆς ἀειδῆ καὶ ἀσώματον (*ib.* 219 D; however, he is not consistent, for in *de hom. opi.* 27 (P. G. 44, 225 C) he regards this story as a proof of the possibility to recognize individual souls after their separation from the body). Eucherius (*instruct.* 1, *de Luca qu.* 7 = 112, 24 *seqq.* Wotke = [Theophil.] *comm. in evang.* 4, p. 321 Otto) puts the question, *numquid corpora apud inferos sunt? aut ut ipse aquam desideret, numquid sitim corporis sentiebat?* and replies: *haec omnia secundum eos affectus loquitur quos aliquando pro necessitate corporis gesserat.* Cf. also Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 122 (534 C/D) and Cassiodor. *de anim.* 11.

Concerning the second question, viz., how Tert. has become acquainted with the interpretation of this story as an *imago*, it should be remembered that Luc. 16, 19 *seqq.* is not discussed by the Greek apologists. That, nevertheless, Tert. found an exegesis of this kind somewhere (the first sentence of § 2 does not give the impression of being an *occupatio*) is made probable by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 4, 6, 30, 4: τί δὲ βούλεται ἡ τοῦ Λαζάρου παραβολὴ τῷ Κυρίῳ πλουσίου καὶ πένητος εἰκόνα δεικνύουσα; The wording of this sentence shows that Clement considers the interpretation as an εἰκὼν (Tert. *imago*) to be self-evident. So we may venture to assert that it was a common interpretation which Tert. combated.

In his discussion of the fate of the soul during the interim between death and resurrection in *res.* 17, where he also borrows many details from ch. 58, Tert. sums up the contents of this chapter in the following words (47, 25 *seqq.*): *nam et nunc animas torqueri foverique penes inferos, licet nudas, licet adhuc exules carnis, probabit Lazari exemplum.*

In conclusion it should be observed that this chapter is not a 'Christian insertion' between ch. 6 and 8, as was asserted by Karpp, 33, but is closely connected with ch. 6 (see the preface to ch. 8, p. 154).

1. *Quantum . . . ex abundanti*: the refutation of the views of the philosophers is followed by a discussion based on Holy Scripture; this method is used throughout this treatise (see Introduction, ch. IV). *Quantum ad* is found from Ovid *ars am.* 1, 744 downwards; for instances from Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 146₁. — *nostros*, viz. the Christians (see comm. on 2, 1). — *ex abundanti* (ἐκ περισσοῦ), which is found from Sen. and Quint. downwards, is primarily a law term, which explains its frequent occurrence in Tert.'s works (see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 101). Instead of *quia* Junius proposed to read *quidem*, but it is not necessary to change the text, which may be paraphrased in this way: "This suffices for the refutation of the philosophers <; so we may

safely end the discussion of this subject here>, as for Christian readers it is too circumstantial already". *corporalitas* is Tp; for *evangelium*, see Matzkow, 26/9. — *relucebit*: cf. 18, 4 and 35, 2. — *apud inferos*: for *apud* as a substitute for the locat., see Gagnér, 94/116. — *cruciat in lingua*: of course this curious construction is due to parallelism (*punitur in flamma*, Luc. 16, 24: ὁδυνῶμαι ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ). An erroneous interpretation is given in Thes. l. L. IV: 1223, 51/3: 'in lingua, i. siti'. — *solacium*: 'refreshment', 'comfort', a meaning which in this treatise is found in six other passages; in 46, 11 s. is almost equivalent to *auxilium*, whereas in 56, 2 and probably also in 34, 2 we find the usual sense 'consolation'; cf. Löfst., *Per.*, 114; Rönsch, *Sem.*, 1, 66; Bonnet, 291; Werner, 131; Appel, 25. The choice of *roris* (Luc. 16, 24 ὕδατος) is obviously due to rhyme.

2. **Et quid**: Tert. frequently puts *et* before an interrogative pronoun (from *de an.* cf. 8, 1; 10, 9; 17, 5 (two instances); 24, 8; 25, 3; 27, 3; 29, 2; 45, 5; 46, 1; 55, 4); for further particulars, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 53/5. An interrogative clause introduced by *et* is often used for the purpose of advancing objections to a view just exposed (Hofm., *Synt.*, 660); this use is particularly frequent in Arnob. (see Löfst., *Arnob.*, 44/8). Cf. also Svenn., *Oros.*, 91 seqq.; Mossberg, 31/2; Koch, *Novat.*, 288; Tidn., *De partic. copulat.*, 71; for the same use in Greek, see Kühn.-Gerth, II 2, 247 seqq.; Blass-Debrunner, § 442, 8. — **Et . . . nomen . . . ?**: the same argument is given by Ambros. in *evang. Luc.* 8, 13 (397, 9/10 Schenkl): *narratio magis quam parabola videtur, quando etiam nomen exprimitur*. The occurrence of a proper name in a parable is exceptional indeed; see Klostermann's note (*Hdb. N. T.*, 5, p. 165). Different interpretations of this fact are given by Euthym. Zingaben. (*comm. in IV evang.*, ad Luc. 16, 20, p. 557 Matthaei: τοῦ πτωχοῦ δὲ τὴν κλῆσιν προσέθηκεν, ὡς ἡγαπημένου) and Aug. *serm.* 41, 4 Maurin. ("Lazarus was mentioned, as his name occurred in the book of the living"). — **Eleazari** (A) is the correct reading; the same form is found in *idol.* 13 (44, 22), whereas in *res.* 17 (48, 1) Tert. writes *Lazari*. Different forms of proper names are also used elsewhere; for instance, Tacitus writes *Syria* (*hist.* 2, 73), *Siria* (*ib.* 2, 74), and *Suriae* (*ib.* 2, 78; cf. Sörbom, 15). From Tert. we may perhaps quote the forms *Appelles* (*adv. Marc.* 3, 11 = 393, 16) and *Apelles* (the usual form). Paulinus Nol., too, writes both *Lazarus* (*ep.* 25, 2 = 231, 23 Hartel; 31, 5 = 273, 16) and *Eleazarus* (*ep.* 13, 16 = 97, 23; 13, 17 = 98, 21, etc.); for the latter form, see the lists drawn up by C. H. Turner (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* 2, 600 seqq. and 9, 72) and A. Souter (*Expositor* 8 (1915), 434). — **si non in veritate res est**: the view of Tert. and Ambrosius that this was a *vera narratio*, is of course shared by such authors as regard this story as an argument in favour of the corporeality of the soul (see preface, p. 148). The opposite view, which was already held by Clem. Alex. (see *ib.*), prevailed in the later centuries; cf. e. g. Gregor. Nazianz. *de parabol. Luc.* and *carm.* 26, 18; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 121/3; Euthym. Zingab. in *Luc.* 16, 19/20; Theophylact. Simocatt. *ad loc.*: παραβολὴ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, ἀλλ' οὐχ, ὥς

τινες ἀνοήτως ἂν οἰηθεῖεν, πρᾶγμα ἐστὶν ἤδη γεγονός. An interpretation which lies midway between the two just mentioned is given by [Justin] *Quaest. et respons. ad orthodox.* 60 (III 2, p. 88 Otto): Τὸ . . . κατὰ τὸν Λάζαρον καὶ τὸν πλούσιον διήγημα οὔτε παραβολή ἐστὶν οὔτε ἱστορία· εἶγε ἡ μὲν παραβολή ἐστὶ λόγος ὁμοιότητα περιέχων τοῦ γεγονότος πράγματος πρὸς τὸ ἐσόμενον, ἱστορία δὲ λόγος διήγησιν περιέχων τοῦ ἤδη γεγονότος πράγματος. οὔτε γὰρ πρὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν ἐκάστω βεβιωμένων ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις γίνεται, οὔτε μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀληθὲς τὸ· 'Ἐχουσι Μωυσέα καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας, ἀκουσάτωσαν αὐτῶν'. Ἔστι δὲ τὸ περὶ Λαζάρου καὶ τοῦ πλουσίου διήγημα ὑποτύπωσις λόγου διδασκαλίαν ἔχοντος τοῦ μὴ δύνασθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον τῆς ψυχῆς κατὰ πρόνοιάν τινα ἢ σπουδὴν ὠφελείας τινὸς τυχεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. — *etsi imago . . . imaginem corporis*: once more Tert. overstrains an idea which in itself is quite reasonable, viz. that the *imago* (or *figura*: cf. 43, 10) must correspond to the *veritas* represented by it. He starts from the right thesis (*adv. Herm.* 34 = 164, 7/9): *quia nihil potest ad similitudinem de suo praestare, nisi sit ipsum, quod tali similitudini praestet* (cf. *Iren.* 2, 34, 1: *typus enim et imago secundum materiam, et secundum substantiam aliquoties a veritate diversus est: secundum autem habitum et lineamentum debet servare similitudinem*). His tendency to exaggerate the closeness of the connection between *imago* and *veritas* is easily understood in the light of his polemics against the heretics, who in their allegorical interpretation of scriptural texts often completely lost sight of the original meaning of the passages they commented upon. This holds good particularly for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh and that of the reality of the body of Christ; hence such statements as are found here are especially frequent in the treatises *De resurr. carn.* and *Adv. Marc.* Striking parallels are furnished by the refutation of the belief that the prophets should have spoken *per imagines* only (*res.* 20 = 52, 10 *seqq.*) and by the discussion on *Ezech.* 37, 1 *seqq.* (*ib.* 30 = 68, 8 *seqq.*): *denique hoc ipso, quod recidivatus Iudaici status de reincorporatione et redanimatione ossuum figuratur, id quoque eventurum ossibus probatur. non enim posset de ossibus figura componi, si non id ipsum et ossibus eventurum esset. nam etsi figmentum veritatis in imagine est, imago ipsa in veritate est sui*. Similarly, in *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (559, 24 *seqq.*) the reality of the body of Christ is proved from *Luc.* 22, 19 in the following way: *acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit, 'hoc est corpus meum' dicendo, id est 'figura mei'. figura autem non fuisset nisi veritatis esset corpus. ceterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset*. Cf. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 39 (557, 23/4): *omne autem signum eius est res, cuius est signum, et omni rei ab eo imponitur signum, cuius est res* (see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 63/4) and Zimmermann, 16/7. — *non caperet imago animae imaginem corporis*: the normal wording would have been *non caperet anima imaginem corporis*, cf. the passage just quoted from *adv. Marc.*: *vacua res . . . figuram capere non posset* (cf. also Plato *Phaedo* 87 D: τὴν αὐτὴν . . . εἰκόνα δέξαιτ' ἂν ψυχὴ πρὸς

σῶμα). Nevertheless, it is not necessary to assume a pleonasm, if we take *caperet* in its most literal sense: "in that case a symbolic representation of the soul (*imago animae*) would not take (choose) the image of the body". A similar thought is expressed by Novatianus in the words directed against the Christ of Marcion (*de trin.* 10): *odisse enim debueras corporis imitationem, si oderas veritatem. — si non erant*: "if they did not really exist"; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 68/9, and in general, Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 404 and Hofm., *Synt.*, 567.

3. For the contents and the structure of this paragraph and the next, see the preface, pp. 146/9. — **post divortium corporis**: in the sense of 'separation' (which by the meaning 'divorce' was never superseded to such a degree as is supposed by Teeuwen, 29; in passages dealing with geography the original meaning was always preserved, as is shown by *Thes. l. L. V*, 1: 1637, 71 *seqq.*) *divortium* is especially frequent in Christian literature, when the separation of body and soul is meant (*Thes. loc. cit.* 1638, 26/33; add *Novat. de trin.* 1; *Lact. div. instit.* 7, 20, 11; *Potam. tract.* 1 (1412 C); [*Orig.*] *tract. de script. sacr.* 1 = 7, 1 Batiffol-Wilmart; from *de an.* cf. 44, 3 and 53, 5). It is possible, as is supposed in the *Thes. l. L.*, that in some of these passages the author wanted to use a metaphor so that there, too, the meaning 'divorce' should be taken into account; in the case of Tert. this is not probable, for he regards body and soul rather as *sorores substantiae* (52, 3), and calls the Holy Spirit the bridegroom of the soul (see comm. on 41, 4). *divortium* frequently means 'divorce' in Tert.'s works; the meaning 'separation' is also found in 19,5: *-o parietis*; *apol.* 27, 4: *ob -um* (sc. diaboli a deo); *ib.* 37, 6; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 3; *orat.* 18 (191, 16); *cor.* 10, 44. — **For quod . . . reservatur**, see 55, 5, for *ad quod . . . patriarcharum*, 55, 1/2. — **Nihil . . . corpus**: this view was borrowed from the Stoics (e. g. *St. V. F.* 2, 359: τὰ πρὸν σῶμα καὶ οὐσίαν); cf. *c. Chr.* 11, 23/4: *Omne, quod est, corpus est sui generis. Nihil est incorporale nisi quod non est* and *adv. Hermog.* 35 (165, 3/4): *cum ipsa substantia corpus sit rei cuiusque*. See the discussions on this subject by Rauch, 19/24 and Stier, 27/9. 37/40. *incorporalitas* is Tp. — **immunis . . . a**: the use of *a* after *immunis* may be due to *libera ab* in the preceding part of the sentence. — **fovella**: ἄ. λ. Three more substantives ending in *-el(l)a* are found for the first time in Tert.'s works, viz. *captatela*, *pull.* 5, 1 (ἄ. λ.); *monella*, *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (538, 5), etc.; *peccatela*, *an.* 40, 2 (ἄ. λ.). Cf. Cooper, 31/2 and Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 38₁. — **reddam . . . oportunius**: viz. in ch. 58 (see comm. on 58, 1). *oportunius* seems to be the correct spelling; *oportune* is given by A in 58, 1 and *ad nat.* 1, 7, 11 (where Borleffs writes *op<p>ortuni*), whereas *ib.* 1, 15, 6 this manuscript has *opportunius*. In *adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (423, 8) Kroymann adopts the orthography of the *cod. Montepess.*, viz. *oportunius*. See also Engelbrecht, *Zeitschr. f. d. österr. Gymn.* 41 (1890), 495.

4. **praecepit**: that Rigaltius is wrong in writing *praecepit*, is evident from *res.* 17 (48, 22/3): *prior de gustans iudicium* (sc. anima),

sicut prior induxit admissum. — *deversorio* is the correct reading, though A has *di-*; in 53, 6 this manuscript gives *devorsorii*, in 54, 3 *deversorium*. In *paen.* 1, 4 Borleffs follows Pamelius in writing *deversentur* (*diversentur* MSS). See also comm. on 53, 1. — *in carcere seu deversorio*, “in what is either a jail or a dwelling-place”; *c. s. d.* is to be regarded as one subst., cf. 10, 7, *totum hoc et vivere et spirare*, and 40, 3, *ceterisque carnalibus non sensibus, sed effectibus*. In *Apul. met.* 5, 1 *dev.* does not mean ‘tavern’ either, but ‘abode’ (see Médan, 151). For the meaning of this passage, cf. especially 53, 6: *prout . . . sentit.* — *sinu Abrahæ*: Tert.’s theory on this subject has originated from his polemics against Marcion, who contended that the worshippers of the *deus creator* obtain a retribution after death *apud inferos*, whereas the followers of Christ reach the *caelestis sinus et portus* (*adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 18/22): *sed Marcion aliorum cogit: scilicet utramque mercedem creatoris sive tormenti sive refrigerii apud inferos determinat, eis positam, qui legi et prophetis oboedierint, Christi vero et dei sui caelestem definit sinum et portum*). According to Tert., all human souls enter the *infern*i after death, where they either dwell in the *sinus Abrahæ* or in the *infern*i in a narrower sense, viz. the place of punishment; this distinction is based by him on *Luc.* 16, 23, cf. *loc. cit.* (536, 22 *seqq.*): *respondebimus et <ad> haec, ipsa scriptura revincente oculos eius, qui ad inferos discernit Abrahæ sinum pauperi. aliud enim inferi* (viz. ‘in a narrower sense’), *ut puto, aliud quoque Abrahæ sinus . . . unde apparet sapienti cuique, qui aliquando Elysios audierit, esse aliquam localem determinationem, quæ sinus dicta sit Abrahæ, ad recipiendas animas filiorum eius, etiam ex nationibus . . . eam itaque regionem, sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non caelestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbere animabus iustorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat*. For a detailed discussion of this subject, see C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, 512 *seqq.* — For further particulars on the conception *sinus Abrahæ*, see Strack-Billerbeck, *Komm. zum N T aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 2, 225/7; Atzberger, *Eschatologie*, 137₂; 245; 276 *seqq.*; 303 *seqq.*; 393 *seqq.*; Kaufmann, *Sepulcraldenkmäler*, 68/70; W. Staerk, art. ‘Abrahams Schoss’, *R A C I*, 27/8; R. Meyer, art. ‘κόλπος’, *Kittel* 3, 824/6 (with more literature); Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 2^a, 640; Merx, *Die Evang. des Markus und Lukas*, 333/9 and 497/504. — *Incorporalitas . . . nihil patitur*: cf. *ad nat.* 1, 10, 9 (*apol.* 12, 7): *quod nihil est, nihil patitur*. For *aut si*, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 89/90. For *in quantum* (from *Tac. ann.* 14, 47, 1 downwards), see Svvnn., *Oros.*, 43; Schrijnen-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 145; Elg, 11; Bonnet, 619/20. — *passibile*: *Tp.*; see for this sentence, Stier, 63/4. This paragraph is referred to by Augustine in *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 25, 41: *Denique Tertullianus, quia corpus animam credidit, non ob aliud nisi quod eam incorpoream cogitare non potuit, et ideo timuit, ne nihil esset, si corpus non esset*, and in the sequel: *Quid enim verius dici potuit, quam id quod ait quodam loco ‘omne corporale passibile est’?*

8. *Refutation of some arguments in favour of the incorporeality of the soul.*

"It is absurd to exclude a thing from the list of corporeal substances on the ground that it does not possess the common characteristics of corporeality. If it did so, what would become of the special differences between all things which form part of creation, and which by their very diversity testify to the greatness of God? (§ 1). Such differences are found throughout the domain of corporeal substances without detriment to their common quality of corporeality (§ 2). — It is said that the soul should be regarded as corporeal, because the body gains in weight after its departure. In refutation of this view Soranus rightly observes that we might as well declare the sea to be incorporeal on the ground that a ship gains in weight, when it is on dry land. How much more vigorous then is the body of the soul, which easily bears the body that afterwards becomes so heavy! (§ 3). — The invisibility of the soul results from the peculiarity of its body, and also from the nature of the substances to which it is invisible. For instance, owls never see the sun, whereas the eyes of eagles are immune to the force of its rays (these birds even kill their young, if a sun-beam forces the latter to avert their eyes) (§ 4). Now the sun is undoubtedly a body (if the owl denies its existence, this does not yet refute what is acknowledged by the eagle!). Similarly, the soul, though invisible to the flesh (and even that is not quite certain), is visible to the spirit: thus St. John in his ecstasy beheld the souls of the martyrs (§ 5)".

This chapter consists of three parts. The first two paragraphs are no more than an introduction; in them Tert. shows that special qualities of the soul not possessed by other corporeal substances do not necessarily constitute an argument against its corporeality; in support of this view he refers to the well-known doctrine of a *concordia discors* in the universe, which he had already defended against Marcion. The first argument in favour of the incorporeality of the soul has been taken from the work of Soranus together with the refutation (we also know from another source that this argument was discussed by Soranus; see comm. on § 3). The argument combated in §§ 4/5 by Tert. may have been mentioned in the same source, whereas in the refutation a part probably harking back to the Ephesian (viz. the syllogism based on the case of the owl who does not see the sun) should be separated from the additions by Tert. (see comm. on §§ 4/5).

According to Karpp (p. 33), the chapters 6 and 8 form a unity broken by ch. 7. This interpretation is wrong, for in chapters 6 and 7 Tert. demonstrates the corporeality of the soul in itself, first by refuting the contrary view of the Platonists, then on the ground of scriptural texts; in ch. 8 he proceeds to the discussion of some special objections. Nor can I agree with Karpp's opinion that the quoting of Soranus in § 3 supports the supposition that this author should have been used throughout the present chapter. Tert., when largely drawing upon a certain work, either mentions the author with that work (for instance Claudius Saturninus in *De corona*), or does not mention him at all (e. g. Irenaeus in ch. 34/5, and his authorities in *Adversus*

Marcionem 1—3). Accordingly, if he mentions Soranus in the midst of this chapter, the most plausible supposition is that he only uses his work in the passage in which he quotes it; this tallies with the fact that the first two paragraphs contain an introduction which is easy to explain from the context, and that at the end other sources have been drawn upon.

1. **Abruptum**: in the sense of 'rash', 'inconsiderate' (Gloss. *immoderatus, infrenatus, inconsideratus*; Thes. l. L. I: 142, 4/5) *abruptus* is found from Sen. *controv.* downwards; from Tert. cf. e. g. *idol.* 12 (43, 1): *illi abruptae propositioni*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 12 (453, 26 seq.); *res.* 51 (105, 1/2): *tam abrupte . . . clausis quod aiunt oculis, sine distinctione, sine condicione.* In *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (519, 28) *abruptus* is almost equivalent to *absurdus*, and *ib.* 1, 1 (291, 20) it is meant for a pun: (Marcion) *Caucaso abruptior*. — **censu**: 'class', 'group'. This meaning, which is found in Tert. for the first time, is very rare afterwards (Thes. l. L. III: 808, 70/80). The explanation of its origin should be based upon passages in which *census* is followed by a name in the genit., and where the meaning 'origo' (see comm. on 1, 1) is still perceptible, for instance *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (537, 8): *in Abrahae censum*, and 5, 8 (598, 12): *ex solo censu David* (in *ad nat.* 2, 12, 26 (*Saturni census*), which passage in Thes. l. L. is combined with the places just quoted, *census* is still completely equivalent to *origo*). The new meaning found here occurs in the following passages: *ad nat.* 2, 1, 10: *deorum censum*; *an.* 31, 5: *de . . . Graeciae -u*; 32, 3; *adv. Prax.* 8 (237, 23); *adv. Val.* 29 (205, 9; cf. 32 = 207, 17); *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (349, 24/5); *pud.* 4 (225, 17); *v. v.* 4; *c. Chr.* 16, 3 and 17, 29; probably also *adv. Marc.* 5, 3 (575, 18; c<ons>ensu Kroym.). The only other instances are found in Arnob. (1, 38 *divorum . . . censum*; in a similar context, 3, 5. 30. 33; 4, 1; 6, 15) and perhaps in *Vulg.* IV Esdr. 5, 1: *qui inhabitant terram in censu multo*. — **ceteris corporalibus exemplis** = *exemplis corporalitatis* ('symptoms of corporeality'; see the note on 43, 8) *quae ceteris corporibus adsunt* (cf. 9, 1). — **adaequet**: in an intransitive sense and followed by a dat. this verb occurs from [Caes.] *bell. Alex.* 16, 5 downwards; from Tert. cf. *an.* 32, 7, *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 4), and perhaps *orat.* 15 (189, 20/1): *huiusmodi . . . quod gentilibus adaequent* (here, however, we might also supply *nos*). Mostly Tert. uses *adaequare* as a transitive verb, e. g. *an.* 24, 1; 32, 8. 10; *iei.* 16 (296, 9/10). — **Et ubi** once more introduces an objection; see the note on 7, 2. — **proprietas**: not 'qualities', but 'special natures', just as in 2, 2. — **signatur**: i. e. *confirmatur* (also in 31, 1; cf. Oehler's index s. v., p. CXCVIII); for *consignare* with the same meaning, cf. the note on 46, 12. — **aemula** = *inimica*; see comm. on 2, 5. For the pleonastic use of *et*, see the note on 1, 6; for *tam . . . quam et*, cf. Müller-Marquardt, 234; Werner, 112; Bechtel, 149. — **ex . . . constare**: originally this is a Stoic doctrine (see Brandt, 50₄) connected with the famous phrase of Heraclitus: πόλεμος πατήρ πάντων (cf. Gigon, *Unters. z. Heraklit*, 25) and widely spread in later philosophy, especially in Neoplatonism; see Capelle, *Neue Jahrb.* 8 (1905), I, 553₂; Jaeger,

Nemesios, 112; Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 143₂; Geffcken, *Ausgang d. Heident.*, 52 (Plotinus); it is also frequently found in Christian literature. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 48, 11: *quae ratio universitatem ex diversitate composuit, ut omnia aemulis substantiis sub unitate constarent, ex vacuo et solido, ex animali et inanimati, ex comprehensibili et incomprehensibili, ex luce et tenebris, ex ipsa vita et morte*; *pall.* 2, 1 (cf. Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 98). Moreover, cf. Novat. *de trin.* 2: *in concordiam elementorum omnium discordantes materias sic conectens, ut ex disparibus elementis ita sit unus mundus ista coagmentata conspiratione solidatus, ut nulla vi dissolvi possit*; Firm. Mat. *de err. prof. relig.* 1 (3, 14/6 Ziegler): *quod omnia elementa ex ipsa sint sua contrarietate coniuncta* and Mathes. 7, praefat.: (deus) *qui ad fabricationem omnium . . . elementorum diversitate composita ex contrariis et repugnantibus cuncta perfecit*; Clem. Alex. *protr.* 1, 5, 1 and *strom.* 4, 6, 40, 3; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 68 (393 C), 164 (632 A), and *append.*, *serm.* 2 (668 B). For the Cappadocians (especially Gregory of Nazianza and Gregory of Nyssa), see Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 143₂, for Eusebius, Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 112₂; from the last period cf. *carm. de provid. div.* 121/9 and Boëth. *consol. philos.* 3, 12, 6. A similar thought is found in *Corp. Hermet.* 14, 7 (258, 30/1 Scott): καὶ μὴ διὰ τὴν ποικίλιαν τῶν γινομένων φυλάξῃ, φοβούμενος μὴ ταπεινότητα καὶ ἄδοξίαν τῷ θεῷ περιάψῃς. The emphasis which in the passage under consideration is laid on the fact that the *diversitas rerum* testifies to the *magnificentia auctoris* comes from Tert.'s polemics against Marcion, who asserted that the *deus potior* held sway over the *invisibilia* only (cf. § 2: *sic multa in dei gloria . . . dum haec invisibilia, illa visibilia*); see comm. on 18, 10, and cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 16 (311, 4/11): *nunc enim communibus plurimum sensibus et argumentationibus iustis securituae scripturarum quoque advocacy fides sternimus, confirmantes diversitatem hanc visibilium et invisibilium deo creatori deputandam, sicuti tota operatio eius ex diversitatibus constat, ex corporalibus et incorporalibus, ex animalibus et inanimalibus, ex vocalibus et mutis, ex mobilibus et stativis, ex genitalibus et sterilibus, ex aridis et succidis, ex calidis et frigidis* (cf. also *ib.* 4, 1 = 425, 25/6). The train of thought underlying this paragraph and the next may be paraphrased in the following way: "the fact that all other bodies are visible and the soul is invisible (this is the main question dealt with in this chapter, as is also evident from the end of § 2) does not yet prove that the soul should not be a body: it is by the very fact that there are both visible and invisible bodies <= substances> that the greatness of God is proved <, who by no means holds sway over invisible substances only, as Marcion asserts>". — *condicunt*: συνομολογοῦσιν. This verb, which is especially frequent in juridical literature (*Thes. l. L. IV*: 138, 25/6 and 61 *seqq.*), in this sense only occurs in Tert.'s works (*Thes. loc. cit.*, 139, 45 *seqq.*), viz. in *adv. Prax.* 17 (258, 22), and with a dat. in *adv. Marc.* 2, 2 (335, 5) and *adv. Herm.* 11 (138, 16/7). In *scorp.* 14 (177, 21), *pud.* 7 (232, 15), and *cor.* 11, 36 the meaning is 'to admit', 'to grant', and in *adv. Marc.* 4, 6 (432, 25) and *v. v.* 11 'to agree upon something', which meaning also frequently occurs in

the works of lawyers. — **Empedoclis**: B 17, 6/8 Diels. As is evident from Hor. *ep.* 1, 12, 19/20, popular philosophy often connected this thesis of Empedocles with the doctrine of a *discordia concors*. These verses are often quoted in doxographical literature, e. g. Theophr. *phys. op. frag.* 3, whence Soranus (or Tert.) must have become acquainted with them; Athenagoras (*legat.* 22 and 24) seems to have borrowed them from a polemic treatise directed against the Stoics (Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 207/8).

2. **obiacent**: 'face them', hence 'are opposed to them'. With a dat. *obiacere* is found from Livy downwards, 2, 65, 4: *saxa obiacentia pedibus*; there seems to be only one other instance of the meaning found here, viz. Boëth. *consol. philos.* 4, 2, 30. — **species . . . genus**: this distinction appears from Varro *r. r.* 1, 8, 1 downwards (cf. also Cic. *top.* 7, 30); see Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 1902, 49 *seqq.* — **genus . . . ut sint corporalia**: 'their kind, viz. corporeality'; *ut* has explanatory force; cf. Hofm., *Synt.* 763/4, and for Tert., Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 72/3. — **sic . . . dum**: similarly, *pall.* 6, 1: *sic denique auditur philosophus, dum videtur*; *adv. Prax.* 7 (229, 26); *test. anim.* 2 (136, 26); not followed by a verb, just as here: *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (340, 2) and *res.* 14 (43, 23/5). In *an.* 17, 4 (*sic quoque fallimur sensibus, dum sententias vertimus*) *dum* has iterative sense according to Hoppe, *Synt.*, 79, but it seems more probable that there, too, it is used in a causal sense. Other instances of this combination are found in Min. Fel. 18, 8, Ambrosiaster in *Rom.* 5, 8, and [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 102 (464 G); cf. also Waltz., *Ét.*, 88 and Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 121/2. — **in dei gloria**: Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 27, thinks that Junius is right in writing *gloriam*. Löfstedt (*ib.*, 27₄) quotes several passages from the later period of the Latin language, where *in* having final force is followed by an ablat.; it is for this reason that in *apol.* 24, 8 he thinks it possible to retain the reading given by the Vulg.: *in honore patris . . . accepit cognomen Iuno*. Several other instances of this use of *in gloria* and *in honore* instead of *in gloriam* (*in honorem*) may be quoted. Perhaps it occurs already in Cic. *pro Flacco* 11, 25: *id quod maxime florere in generis sui gloria viderat*; after the second century after Christ the examples become more numerous, e. g. *Did. apostol.* 26, 29/30 Hauler: *tamquam in omnipotentis gloria* (but *ib.* 26, 24/5: *in honorem omnipotentis Dei*; see Tidn., *Did. quaest.*, II, 65); *Peregr. Aether.* 8, 2. Geyer, *Bursians Jahresber.* 98 (1899), 72, refers to *S H A XXX tyranni* 4, 1: *in honore Augusti*, and *ib.* 11, 1: *in contemptu Gallieni*, Petschenig, *Philol.* 52 (1894), 362, to Venant. Fortun. *carm.* 2, 2, 6; 3, 7; 1, 7 *inscr.* See also Löfst., *Eran.* 7 (1907), 68; A. Moeller, *Quaest. Servianae* (Kiel 1892), 11; W. A. Baehrens, *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 411/2. In [Ambros.] *de orig. anim.* (Caspari, *Anecd.*, p. 228; see *ib.* p. 240, note 101) it is not certain whether we should read *in dei gloriam* or *gloria*. — **invisibilia . . . levia**: the last two pairs of adjectives constitute a transition to §§ 3/5.

3. As far as I know, the apparent increase in the weight of dead bodies is quoted nowhere else as an argument in favour of the incor-

poreality of the soul. That, however, this fact played some part in discussions on the essence of the soul is proved by Lucr. 3, 228/30: *quare etiam atque etiam mentis naturam animaeque/scire licet perquam paucillis esse creatam/seminibus, quoniam fugiens nil ponderis aufert*; from the circumstance that the weight of the body is not diminished by death, he infers the extreme minuteness of the atoms of the soul. The argument of Soranus obviously ran as follows: "the soul is corporeal, but bears and lifts up the body (he may have written βαστάζει καὶ κουφίζει τὸ σῶμα; cf. the subsequent passage), just as the sea bears and lifts up ships; consequently, from the fact that without this κούφισις, a body (apparently) increases in weight, we are no more allowed to infer that the soul is incorporeal than the incorporeality of the sea is inferred from the (apparent) increase in the weight of a ship on dry land". In this context Karpp (p. 33₁) refers to *Anon. Londin.* XXXI, 25 *seqq.* (ed. Diels, *Supplem. Aristotel.* III 1 (Berolini 1893), p. 58/60), where the same argument is found. In this passage the author (who, according to Wellmann, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 396/429, is no other than Soranus) contests the assertion of the adherents of the empirical school that a thing may grow in weight through ἀφαίρεσις, which assertion among other things is based on the fact that the human body becomes heavier after death. In refutation of this he says (XXXI, 51 *seqq.*): εἴτα καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ βραχέων λέγομεν, ὥς ἡ ψυχὴ αἰτία ἐστὶν γινομένη τῆς κουφότητος... δι' ἣν αἰτίαν παρούσης μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς κούφον ἐστὶν τὸ ζῶιον, ὅτι καὶ πνεῦμα ἡ ψυχὴ, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κούφον τὴν φύσιν. πνευματικὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ· τοιαύτη δὲ ὑπάρχουσα εὐλόγως παρούσα μὲν κούφον παρέχει τὸ ζῶιον, ἀποῦσα δὲ βαρύτερον. οὕτως γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς βαστάζεται αὐτὸ τὸ ὅλον σῶμα... διὸ δὲ καὶ ῥητέον, ὅτι οὐχ ὅταν τινὸς γένηται πρόσθεσις, ἐκεῖνο γίνεται βαρύτερον, ἀλλὰ ἐὰν βαρέος τινὸς τι γίνεται πρόσθεσις, ἐκεῖνο γίνεται βαρύτερον. ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ τοσοῦτον ἀπέχει τοῦ εἶναι βαρεῖα, ὥστε καὶ τὸ φύσει καταρρέπον κουφίζειν καὶ βαστάζειν. ταύτης οὖν παρούσης δεόντως κούφον ἐστὶν τὸ ζῶιον. ὅταν μέντοι γε ἀφανισθῇ ἡ ψυχὴ, τῷ μηκέτι παρῆναι τὸ κούφισον μηδὲ αἰωροῦν λοιπὸν βαρεῖα φαίνεται εὐλόγως τὰ νεκρὰ ταύτης αἰτία. Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 418₂, refers to a fragment of Diocles (Wellm., *Frg. d. gr. Ärzte*, 1, frag. 19), an author from whom Soranus borrowed largely (see Introduction, p. 26*): καθάπερ οὖν οἱ βαστάζοντες φόρτιον ἤτοι βαρυνόμενοι πρὸς αὐτοῦ κινεῦνται μόλις ἢ κούφον εἶναι νομίζοντες ἀλύπως φέρουσιν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ δύναμις ἡ μὲν ἰσχυρὰ (sc. τῆς ψυχῆς) ῥαδίως τὸ βάρος τοῦ σώματος φέρει, ὥς μηδὲν εἰς τὰς κινήσεις τοῦ σώματος βλάπτεσθαι, etc. At all events it is notable that both Diocles and Tert. (Soranus) in this context emphasize the strength of the soul. This, too, was a much discussed subject in such systems as upheld the corporeality of the soul; for instance, Lucretius (4, 898 *seqq.*; cf. also 5, 556/7) illustrates the movement of the heavy body by the minute atoms of the soul by comparing the body to a ship and the soul to the wind or the hand of the helmsman (for the comparison of the body to a ship in medical literature, cf. e. g. *Paris. graec. supplem.* 636, 37r 5/6

(ed. Fuchs, Rh. Mus. 58 (1903), 99): ἐπεὶ καθάπερ νεὼς τοῦ σώματος ὑπόζωμα ὑπάρχει (sc. ὁ στόμαχος), ὥς φησιν Ἀρίστων ὁ ἀπὸ Πέτρωνος). — *validius*, sc. *quam mare*, the *tertium comparationis* being (*circum*)-*fert*: *sicut mare navem circumfert, sic anima corpus*. Now, the body as compared to the soul is much heavier than the ship compared to the sea; so the relative strength of the soul is much greater than that of the sea. — *postea*: once more the adverb has the function of an adjunct.; see comm. on I, 2. — *circumfert*: *circumferre* is frequently used in this context; from Tert. cf. *ad mart.* 2: *totum hominem animus* (here Tert. does not yet write *anima*; see preface on ch. 12) *circumfert*; *res.* 7 (36, 1/3); *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (393, 17) and 4, 12 (452, 23); *c. Chr.* 13, 37. To the above passages from medical literature may be added *Corp. Herm.* 10, 13: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα διῆκον διὰ φλεβῶν καὶ ἀρτηριῶν καὶ αἵματος κινεῖ τὸ ζῶον καὶ ὥσπερ τρόπον τινὰ βασιτάζει; Philo *leg. alleg.* 3, 70: ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μέχρις ἑκατονταετίας . . . τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φέρει κούφως ἀνδρίαντα μὴ κάμνουσα; M. Aurel. 9, 24.

4. The invisibility of the soul, which was emphasized for the first time by Plato (*Phaedo* 79 A *seqq.*) and also acknowledged by the Stoics, was regarded by the opponents of the last-mentioned philosophers as a strong argument in favour of its incorporeality, as is shown by Alex. Aphrodis. *de anim. libri mant.* p. 113, 31 Bruns (St. V. F. 2, frag. 794): εἰ ἡ ψυχὴ σῶμα, πᾶν δὲ σῶμα μιᾷ γέ τινι αἰσθήσει αἰσθητὸν τῇ αὐτοῦ φύσει (λέγω δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐνεργείᾳ ὄντων σωμάτων καί, ὥς φασιν αὐτοί, πεποιημένων) εἴη ἂν καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αἰσθητή (οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἄποιόν γε σῶμα αὐτὴν ἐροῦσιν, ἔσται γὰρ ὕλη), οὐκ ἔστιν δὲ οὐκ ἄρα σῶμα. It is highly probable that Soranus, *cum omnibus philosophorum sententiis expertus* (6, 6), discussed this argument as well, so that Tert. must have become acquainted with it through him. With reference to Tert.'s refutation a distinction should be made between the first and the second argument. The assertion that the soul's invisibility is dependent on the nature of its body and as such does not prove its incorporeality is completely on a level with numerous sophistic arguments occurring in other works of Tert., and may therefore be ascribed to himself. On the other hand, the syllogism based on the case of the owl ("if the owl does not see the sun, this does not prove that the sun is invisible <and hence incorporeal>; similarly, if the flesh cannot see the soul, this does not prove the soul's invisibility") may quite well have come from Soranus, for this example was also used by the Sceptics (see comm. on *Solem . . . nesciunt oculis*); the enlargement of this argument by the reference to the eagle is almost certainly an idea of Tert., for this example seems to have been borrowed by him from Pliny. The addition of *si forte* in § 5 ("it is not even certain that the soul is always invisible to the flesh") and the argument from Holy Scripture, which, as usual, forms the conclusion, are of course Tert.'s own work. — *Ceterum etsi*, etc.: the correct interpretation of this sentence was given by Hartel, who paraphrases (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 54): "*Ceterum anima, et si invisibilis, est invisibilis et pro natura*, etc." *Ib.*, 11, he quotes a parallel from *spect.* 15 (17, 6/8):

et si qui modeste et probe spectaculis fruitur . . . , non tamen immobili animo et (A; immobilis animi est et Reifferscheid) sine tacita spiritus passione (sc. fruitur). — **et pro condicione . . . eorum**: of course it is wrong to follow Gelenius in inserting *pro* before *proprietate*, for Tert. mentions two, not three, causes: the soul is invisible because of both its own nature and of the nature of the substances to which it is invisible; the words *condicione corporis sui* and *proprietate substantiae* denote one and the same thing. Many parallels may be quoted, e. g. 18, 2: *egressus . . . ab oculis et auribus et, quod dicendum sit, a toto corpore*; Apul. *Asclep.* 5 (39, 27 Thom.): *quae fiunt aut ab diis aut daemonibus aut ab hominibus*; S H A *Gordian.* 22, 5: *et a militibus et populo et a senatu*. For some other instances, see Baehrens, *Beitr.*, 313/8 (who, however, quotes many passages in which either the text is doubtful or another interpretation should be preferred). On Cic. *nat. deor.* 1, 1, 2: *nam et de figuris deorum et de locis atque sedibus et actione vitae multa dicuntur*, Sjögren, *Tull.*, 140, remarks: “forsitan quispiam ita excuset, ut duo tantum membra agnoscat”, which certainly is the right interpretation. See also comm. on 20, 4: *de corpore et valetudine*. — **esse sortita est**: the connection of *sortiri* with an infin. is a Grecism (οἷς ὁράτος εἶναι ἔλαχεν). The same construction is found in 12, 3; 37, 1; 43, 6; *res.* 18 (49, 20); 26 (64, 7); *adv. Val.* 10 (188, 8/9), i. e. in three contemporary treatises. Before Tert. only one instance is found, which is not completely similar, viz. [Verg.] *Ciris* 397: *illi* (sc. Castor et Pollux) *etiam alternas sortiti vivere lucas* (Ascensius *ad loc.*: “sortiti sunt alternatim vivendo et moriendo”). From the period subsequent to Tert. we may quote Filastr. 24, 4: *Belus . . . hoc nomen aut cognomen habere sortitus est*; Prud. *apoth.* 888/9: (anima) *quae carne coactam sortita est habitare domum*; Mar. Victorin. *adv. Arium.* 4, 11: *esse sortita sunt* (τὸ εἶναι εἰλήχασιν). — **Solem . . . nesciunt oculis**: the same use of the ablat. is found in cor. 2, 1: *neminem dico fidelium coronam capite nosse*, and *apol.* 42, 6: *nos coronam naribus novimus* (Esser, *Bibl. d. Kirchenväter*², 24, p. 153₁, supposes that the text is corrupt here; cf., however, Min. Fel. 38, 2: *auram bonam floris naribus ducere* (see Axelson, *Min. Fel.*, 107); cor. 5, 31/3: *Tam contra naturam est florem capite sectari, quam cibum aure, quam sonum nare*; *adv. Prax.* 14 = 250, 26). For the use of *nescire*, see Rönisch, *It.*², 373 and *Sem.* 3, 60; Goelz., *Jér.*, 305 and *Sever.*, 37. Though we must consider the possibility that this argument in its entirety was invented by Tert. himself, at all events (the next two sentences have been borrowed by him from Pliny; see the next note), it is more probable that he took it from Soranus, as owls are mentioned by Sextus Empiricus in a similar context (*adv. math.* 9, 247; for the relations between Soranus and the Sceptics, see Introduction, p. 30*): μίαν μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει δύναμιν (sc. τὸ αἰτιῶν), ἐπεὶ περ εἰ μίαν εἶχεν, ὥφειλε πάντα ὁμοίως διατιθέναι καὶ μὴ διαφερόντως. οἷον ὁ ἥλιος καίει μὲν τὰ περὶ τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν μέρη, θάλλει δὲ τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καταυγάζει δὲ μόνον τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους, . . . καὶ ἡ μὲν μὲν τοῦ ὁρᾶν αἰτίος γίνεται, τοῖς νυκτινόμοις δὲ τῶν ὁρνίθων, οἷον γλαυξὶ καὶ νυκτερίσι, τοῦ μὴ ὁρᾶν. — **aquilae**, etc.: see

the passages collected by E. Oder, R. E. I, 371, and Th. Schneider, R A C 1, 87 and 92 (from Christian literature we may add Ambros. in *Ps.* 118, 19, 13; Clem. Alex. *protr.* 10, 92, 5; Isidor. *Orig.* 12, 7, 11). Tert. certainly uses the account given by Pliny (*n. h.* 10, 10): *haliaëtus tantum implumes etiamnum pullos suos percutiens subinde cogit adversos intueri solis radios, et, si coniventem umectantemque animadvertit, praecipitat e nido velut adulterinum atque degenerem. illum cuius acies firma contra stetit educat.* — **generositatem**: τὴν εὐγενεῖαν. Referring to mental qualities this subst., which is found for the first time in Colum., is used almost exclusively by Christian authors (see Thes. 1. L. VI, 2: 1798, 19 *seqq.*). — **educabunt**: a gnostic future; see the note on 10, 5. — **alioquin** (A) is the correct reading, for this form occurs in seven more places of *an.*, and there is also given by B Gel (from Pliny *n. h.* downwards *alioquin* begins to supersede *alioqui*; see Thes. 1. L. I: 1591, 24/8). For the pleonasm (*alioquin* and a relative clause), see comm. on 48, 2.

5. **adeo** once more is equivalent to *ideo* (see comm. on 1, 4); in the eight other places in *an.* where *adeo* occurs in this sense it is the first word of the sentence. — **praeiudicans aquilae**: the use of *praeiudicare* with a dat. (also *pud.* 15 (251, 27) and *fuga* 4, 1) belongs to juridical Latin, e. g. Macer *dig.* 42, 1, 63: *res inter alios iudicatas aliis non praeiudicare*; Ulp., *ib.* 47, 10, 7, 1; for further details, see Friebel, 18. — **Tantundem**: 'likewise'; the original meaning ('to the same degree') is still perceptible. For the gradual development of the neutral accus. *tantundem* (*tantusdem* is found nowhere, the reading *tantadem* in Liv. 22, 49, 15 being no more than an erroneous conjecture by Madvig, see Svenn., *Pallad.*, 641) into an adverb via of such expressions as *tantundem distare*, see Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 209, 2, 16 *seqq.*; Svenn., *op. cit.*, 324 and Eran. 26 (1928), 155 *seqq.*; *ib.* 27 (1929), 86₃; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 124₂. — **si forte** is found as an isolated expression from Cic. and Lucr. downwards (Thes. 1. L. VI: 1134, 4 *seqq.*). It is frequently used in Tert.'s works, where it should be translated differently according to the context and to the drift of the sentence to which it is attached (Rönsch, *It.*², 344₉; for its Greek equivalent εἰ τύχοι, see Wetstein's note on 1 Cor. 14, 10). This expression, which often has ironical sense, is frequently used for the purpose of emphasizing the slight probability of a supposed case; accordingly, in this passage Tert. uses it to indicate that it is by no means certain that the soul is really invisible to the flesh under every circumstance. Cf. e. g. *apol.* 38, 5: *si oblectari novissime nolumus, nostra iniuria est, si forte, non vestra* ("le dommage est pour nous, si dommage il y a", Waltzing); *iei.* 17 (297, 16/7): *facilius, si forte, per angustam salutis ianuam introibit caro exilior* ("if indeed the flesh manages to pass through that door", a possibility represented as improbable in *de ieiunio*); *an.* 55, 2: *aspernati, si forte, in Abrahae sinu . . . solacium capere* (but it is improbable that such people should ever reach Abraham's bosom); *Pass. Perpet.* 18, 1: *si forte, gaudio parentes, non timore* ("if they trembled indeed, it was with joy, not with fear"). *Si forte* also frequently has a neutral sense, and is almost equi-

valent to *forte*, e. g. *apol.* 41, 4: *et sequitur, ut omnes saeculi plagae nobis, si forte* ("s'il nous frappent", Waltzing), *in admonitionem a deo obveniant*. A further differentiation of the meaning of *si forte*, as given by Rönisch, *It.*², 344, is not in keeping with the instances found in Tert.'s works. See also Oehler's note on *cor.* 5 and Rönisch, *Sem.*, 2, 82. — *spiritui . . . est*: a proof of this assertion is given in 9,4. Cf. *adv. Prax.* 7 (237, 13/5): *sed si et invisibilia illa, quaecumque sunt, habent apud deum et suum corpus et suam formam, per quae soli deo visibilia sunt*. Though the assertion found here primarily derives from *Apoc.* 6, 9, it is not impossible that Tert. was also influenced by Tatian. *orat.* 15 (16, 28/31 Schwartz; cf. Puech., *Apol. Gr.*, 333): *μόνοις γοῦν τοῖς πνεύματι θεοῦ προουρουμένοις εὐσύνοπτα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐστὶ σώματα, τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐδαμῶς, λέγω δὲ τοῖς ψυχικοῖς*. We may also refer to 53, 6, where self-perception of the soul at the moment of death is described. In *c. Chr.* 11, 17/20 the invisibility of the soul is even adduced as an argument in favour of its corporeality (as to the argument, cf. 7, 4): *Et tamen, cum invisibilem dicunt, corporealem constituunt, habentem quod invisibile sit* (7, 4: *Incorporalitas enim nihil patitur, non habens per quod pati possit; aut si habet, hoc erit corpus*.) *Nihil enim habens invisibile quomodo invisibilis potest dici?* See for this passage, Rauch, 28/9 (who, however, does not interpret all relevant passages correctly). — *in spiritu dei factus*: in *Thes. l. L. VI*: 113, 78 this expression is wrongly combined with 9, 7: *cum . . . factus esset homo in animam vivam*. It should be regarded as a Grecism, as it is equivalent to *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ γενόμενος* (of course after the example of *Apoc.* 1, 10; 4, 2: *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*). We should rather compare 9, 4: *cum ea soror in spiritu esset*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 22 (493, 1): *in spiritu . . . homo constitutus*; *Novat. trin.* 29: *in hoc spiritu positus*. From Greek literature (where this construction occurs already in the classic period, e. g. *Lysias orat.* 24, 25: *γενόμενος ἐν δυνάμει*) numerous examples may be quoted, for instance *Mart. Polyc.* 5: *ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ γέγονεν*; *Anaphora Pilati A* and *B* 11 (p. 419 and 425 Tischendorf): *ἐν ἐκστάσει γενόμενος*; *Plut. Aem. Paul.* 39. Cf. the note on *Apoc.* 1, 10 by Lohmeyer (*Hdb. N. T.* IV 4, p. 13), who rightly points out that *ἐν ἐκστάσει γενέσθαι* always refers to a transitory state of ecstasy. — *animas martyrum conspicit*: see comm. on the fuller discussion of this subject in 9, 8.

9. Further consequences of the corporeality of the soul: it possesses shape and colour.

"Since the soul is a body of a particular nature, it either, on account of its being a body, possesses the same qualities as other bodies (though in a form and a degree appropriate to its peculiar disposition), or it lacks them <, for instance visibility, > on account of its particularity. At all events, it possesses three dimensions (§ 1); it also possesses a definite shape, though this is thought to be impossible by Plato who argues that the soul, if possessing a shape, would be complex, and *qua* being complex would be dissoluble, which is incompatible

with its immortality (§ 2). To prove that the soul possesses a shape, we have a special argument at our disposal owing to the fact that by the grace of God we are still enlightened by revelations (§ 3). In our community lives a sister who frequently obtains revelations, the contents of which are strongly influenced by what she has heard or seen immediately before her getting into ecstasy. It happened that I had just preached about the soul, when this sister went into ecstasy. At the end of the service she told us (as she usually relates the contents of her visions, which are carefully noted down for further examination) that she had seen the soul as a delicate and luminous essence provided with an airy colour and a human shape. Now a vision certainly deserves to find credence, if its details are plausible to such a degree (§ 4). For if the soul is a body, it must possess some colour no less than other bodies; and which colour is more appropriate to the soul than an airy and luminous one? Of course in asserting this I do not mean that light or air should be its substance, as has been contended by some philosophers; I only say so, because whatever is thin and subtle (and the soul is so subtle, that the existence of its body is frequently questioned) is commonly compared to air (§§ 5/6). <We must, however, return to the shape of the soul>. That the human soul has the shape of a human body <, as was shown by the vision>, more exactly of the body in which it stays, is suggested, first, by common sense, secondly, by considering the creation of Adam as related in Gen. 2, 7: the breath of God must have filled the body of Adam and so have adopted its shape (§ 7). The soul shaped in this way is the 'interior man'; it possesses the same members as the body. Hence the rich man in hell has a tongue, etc.; hence the souls of the martyrs resting under the altar <of Heaven> were recognizable to St. John (§ 8)".

Though it is not out of the question that Soranus ascribed to the soul a definite shape (as is also doubtfully assumed by Karpp, p. 44), Tert. in this chapter cannot have drawn largely upon his work. The note concerning the *trifariam distantivum* in § 1 and the doxographical material found in § 5 must be traced back to the Ephesian, and the description of the *cerauniae gemmae* and the *berylli* was certainly taken from Pliny; as to the passages from Plato, see the Introduction, p. 41*. All other data were borrowed by Tert. from Holy Scripture (§§ 7/8) or from his own experience (the vision described in § 4). The introduction, which may be regarded as a continuation of the first two paragraphs of ch. 8, clearly shows Tert.'s usual way of reasoning. The discussion of the colour of the soul has resulted from the refutation of Plato (see the comm. on § 2) and from the contents of the vision; that Soranus, too, gave his opinion upon this subject, as is supposed by Karpp, *loc. cit.*, is far from plausible. Typical of Tert. are the references to the *sensus communes* and to the *forma primordii* (see the comm.) in § 7.

1. *Cum animae . . . ceteris adsint*: this tortuous sentence serves to create a transition between ch. 8 and ch. 9. Whereas in the preceding

chapter Tert. had stressed the particular character of the body of the soul to explain its being invisible, while all other bodies are visible, he is now going to put it on a level with other bodies for the purpose of demonstrating that it has a definite shape (for a paraphrase of this sentence, see the preface). — **adserimus . . . generis**: the best solution is to follow B in reading *propriae qualitatis et sui generis*. Instead of *et sui* A gives *et sensui*, which induced Gomperz to write *esse et sui*. But in such cases Tert. usually has no infin., cf. e. g. 11, 1: *animam, quam flatum . . . defendimus*; 11, 2; 21, 3: *animale, quod statu simplex et uniforme defendimus*; with a dat., 17, 4: *Epicurei . . . parem omnibus (sensibus) . . . defendunt veritatem*; 5, 1: *alios . . . corpus animae vindicantes*; 6, 6; 11, 1; for *adsero*, see the numerous similar passages in Thes. l. L. II: 867, 10 *seqq.* — **propriae qualitatis et sui generis**: cf. *adv. Prax.* 7 (237, 12): *spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie*; c. Chr. 6, 56/8: *Constat angelos carnem non propriam gestasse, utpote natura substantiae spiritalis, etsi corporalis alicuius, sui tamen generis, etc.* — **accidentibus**: as a subst. *accidens* occurs from Sen. downwards in the sense of “that which happens to somebody”, and from Quint. downwards as a technical term of rhetoric. As a translation of the philosophic term *συμβεβηκός* it is found for the first time in Tert.’s works, where the original sense “something added <from the outside>” is always perceptible; for further details, see the notes on 6, 5; 20, 4; 25, 4. — **praeiudicabit**: see comm. on 2, 2. — **aut haec adesse, quam corpus ostendimus**: it is unnecessary to insert *ei* before *quam* with Ursinus (who is followed by Oehler and Reifferscheid), or to write *qua* instead of *quam* with Pamelius, as Tert. frequently omits the antecedent, if it is to be a demonstrative pronoun. Of course we should make a distinction between cases where the antecedent denotes a definite notion and may easily be added mentally, and such passages as 17, 9: *qui . . . auruginant, amara sunt omnia*, or *adv. Marc.* 1, 19 (314, 16/7): *statim, qui sapit, plana res est*, where the relative clause is equivalent to a conditional sentence (see Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.*, 1, 40/1 and Svenn., *Pallad.*, 480₂). In this passage, which belongs to the former class, the relative clause has causal sense. For Tert., cf. Löfst., *Apol.*, 98/9; *Krit. Apol.*, 70; *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 54/5; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 111/2; Baehrens, *Beitr.*, 328; Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 57 (1929), 30₃; 59 (1931), 89; 60 (1932), 88₁; Waltzing, *Ét.*, 225/6. We may add 33, 7; *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (291, 7/8): *qui non ita decesserint, ut escatiles fuerint, maledicta mors est*; *test. anim.* 4 (139, 4): *debes adulari propter quos laetius vivis*; *Luc.* 22, 22 in *adv. Marc.* 4, 41 (561, 8): *vae, ait, per quem traditur filius hominis* (ὁὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔξινῳ, δι’ οὗ). For further details, see Kühn-Stegm., 2, 281 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 707; Baehrens, *Beitr.*, 324 *seqq.*; Stangl, *Pseudoascon.*, 131/2; Sjögren, *Comm. Tull.*, 163 *seqq.*; Eran. 13 (1913), 131; *ib.* 19 (1919), 169; Svenberg, 107; Krumbiegel, 42 *seqq.*; Heidrich, 44/7; Wahlén, 32/3; Blomgren, *Stud. Fort.*, 1, 35/6; Pettersson, *Comm. Liv.*, 30 *seqq.* — After *adesse* a dat. not denoting a person is seldom found (also in § 5). — **pro corporis proprietate**: “on account of the peculiarity of this <special> body”, viz. the *corpus animae*. — **corporibus ceteris**:

cf. 8, 1: *ceteris corporalibus exemplis*, and the comm. — *sollemniora quaeque*: for the use of *quisque* after a comparat. in Tert., see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 50. An early isolated instance is found in Rhet. ad Herenn. 4, 25, 35: *habet in se quendam leporem superioris cuiusque crebra repetitio verbi*; the case is not quite similar, because *superior* is equivalent to *antecedens*, and does not take the place of a superlative (Wölfflin, *Compar.*, 79). A use of the comparat. with *quisque* as found here occurs for the first time in Apul. *de mundo* 25: *propiores quosque*. For further details, see Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 79/80; Hofm., *Synt.*, 466; Goelz., *Jér.*, 411; Elg., 20/1. — *debita*: see comm. on 24, 11. — *trifariam distantivum*: τὸ τριχῇ διαστατόν (according to F. Bömer, *Der lat. Neuplaton. und Neupythagor.*, 118_s, this very common expression occurs for the first time in a fragment of Apollodorus of Seleucia (6 = *St. V. F.* 3, p. 259); from an earlier period we may quote Arist. *de caelo* 268a 23/4 and *metaph.* 4, 6 (1016b 27): τὸ ... τριχῇ διαιρετὸν κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν σώμα). The opposite view is upheld by Nemes. (*de nat. hom.* 2 = p. 71/2 Matth.): ... τῇ ψυχῇ, καθ' ἑαυτὴν μὲν πρόσεστι τὸ ἀδιάστατον, κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς δὲ τῷ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστι, τριχῇ διαστατῷ ὄντι, συνθεωρεῖται καὶ αὐτὴ τριχῇ διαστατή), who combats the Stoics (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 451). The ἀδιάστατος οὐσία of the soul is frequently discussed by the Neoplatonists and the commentators of Aristotle; see Bömer, *op. cit.*, 121/4. The adject. *distantivus* occurs in one other passage only (Chalcid. *comm.* 16), where it has a different meaning. — *sublimitatem* is put instead of *altitudinem*, just as in 32, 6: *nullius sublimitatis, nullius profunditatis*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (537, 3/4); *Rom.* 8, 39 in *scorp.* 13 (175, 12): *neque sublimitas* (ὕψωμα, Vulg. *altitudo*) *neque profundum*; *Eph.* 4, 8 in *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (598, 20/1): *ascendit in sublimitatem* (ὕψος, Vulg. *altum*). In enumerations of the three dimensions (e. g. Vitruv. 1, 2, 3; Apul. *Asclep.* 34; Claud. Mam. *de stat. anim.* 1, 25) it is usual to write *altitudo*.

2. *damus* is almost equivalent to *concedimus*; see comm. on 10, 9. — *periclitetur de*: *de* attached to *periclitari* is also found in § 6; c. *Chr.* 12, 34; *pud.* 22 (271, 19); cf. comm. on 27, 6. — *effigiatum*: this rare verb, which occurs from Apul. downwards, is also found in 22, 2. — The syllogism here ascribed to Plato really consists of a combination of two passages, viz. *Phaedo* 78 B/C: Ἄρ' οὖν τῷ μὲν συνετέντι τε καὶ συνδέτῳ ὄντι φύσει προσήκει τοῦτο πάσχειν, διαιρεθῆναι ταύτην, ἥπερ συνετέθη, and *Phaedrus* 247 C, where Plato discusses the νοητά in general, not especially the soul: ἡ γὰρ ἀχρώματός τε καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἀναφής οὐσία ὄντως οὐσα, ψυχῆς κυβερνήτη μόνῳ θεατῇ νῶ, etc. In doxographical literature nothing corresponding to this syllogism is found; Albinus in a general survey of the qualities of the soul (*epit.* 25) only mentions the predicates ἀσώματος, ἀσύνθετος, ἀδιάλυτος, ἀσκέδατος, ἀνώλεθρος, ἀφθαρτος, and μονοειδής. It is impossible to decide whether the present argument was formulated by later Platonists and handed down to Tert. by Soranus or was constructed by Tert. himself (in 6, 1 we also find a syllogism which does not occur in Plato's works; there, however, Tert. explicitly mentions the *Plato-*

nici). — **structile**: before Tert. this adjunct., which is found from Vitruv. and Colum. downwards, is only used as a technical term of building-industry (e. g. Martial. 9, 75, 1: *non silice duro structilive caemento*; Vitruv.: *s. canalis, s. cloaca*). — **dissolubilis** and **indissolubilis** are found from Cic. downwards, **compositicius** before Tert. only occurs in Varro *l. l.* 6, 55 and 8, 61 (see Dahlmann, 56); **ineffigiatus** is used for the first time by Gell. and Apul. (*ineffigiabilis* (24, 1) is $\dot{\alpha}$. λ .).

3. **corporales . . . lineas**: though this expression was partly caused by the words *intellectualibus formis* in the preceding paragraph, it is meant quite literally, as is shown by the next discussion. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (340, 15/7): *neque enim facie et corporalibus lineis, tam variis in genere humano, ad uniformem deum expressus est* (sc. homo). — **per aestimationem**: “by <merely human> supposition”, as opposed to divine revelation; cf. *apol.* 45, 2: *humana aestimatio*; Hier. *ep.* 119, 7, 3; Cassian. *c. Nestor.* 6, 1, 2. For the ‘Christianism’ *revelatio*, see Matzkow, 18. The words *ex constantia gratiae* are explained by the next sentence (*post Iohannem quoque*). For Tert.’s views about divine grace, which do not concern us here, see d’Alès, *Théol.*, 264/72; Adam, *Kirch. Tert.*, 109 *seqq.*; 119/20; 154; 224 *seqq.*; Klein, 232/3 and 372; N. Bonwetsch, *Festgabe A. von Harnack* (Tübingen 1921), 97/9. — **spiritalia charismata**: “the spiritual gifts of grace”, viz. those acknowledged by the Montanists, in the first place the *charisma prophetiae* (that in the Church in general the occurrence of *charismata* was still assumed in the second century, is shown by such passages as Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 82. 88 (cf. Bonwetsch, *Montan.*, 128_g) and Iren. 2, 49, 3 and 5, 6, 1; it is for this reason that Bonwetsch (*op. cit.*, 25) and Harnack (*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 3, 371₂) wrongly suppose Irenaeus to have approached Montanism). Cf. *mon.* 1: *penes nos autem, quos spirituales merito dici facit agnitio spiritualium charismatum*; *Pass. Perpet.* 1, 5: *nos, qui sicut prophetias ita et visiones novas pariter repromissas et agnoscimus et honoramus, ceterasque virtutes Spiritus Sancti ad instrumentum Ecclesiae deputamus*; *ib.*: *gratiam divinitatis . . . sive in martyrum sive in revelationum dignatione*. For the *agnitio paracleti* frequently mentioned at the end of Tert.’s works, see comm. on 58, 8, for *spiritalis*, Labriolle, *Cris. Mont.* 141₃, for *charisma*, Wetter, *Charis*, 168₁ and 182/3; Sainio, 36 *seqq.* *Spiritalia charismata* are also frequently mentioned outside the sphere of Montanism, cf. *Thes. l. l.* III: 996, 5/7 and Hier. *adv. Rufin.* 2, 25. Adam (*Kirch.*, 141) rightly points out that Tert. was the first to confine the influence of the *spiritus divinus* on ecstasy to the *paracletus*. — **post Iohannem quoque**: according to Tert., Matth. 11, 13 (πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἔως Ἰωάννου προσήτευσαν) only refers to prophecies concerning the appearance of Christ. Cf. *adv. Iud.* 8, 105/9: . . . *et merito evangelista: ‘lex et prophetae’, inquit, ‘usque ad Iohannem baptistam’*. *Baptizato enim Christo, id est sanctificante aquas in suo baptismo, omnis plenitudo spiritualium retro charismatum in Christo cessavit signante visiones et prophetias omnes, quas adventu suo adimplevit*; *ib.* 11, 58/9. Polemical intentions against the opposite view are assumed by Labriolle (*Crise Mont.*, 565₃) in this passage

and in *iei.* 2 (275, 20/1); such intentions are more obvious in *iei.* 11 (290, 3/7): *sed rursus palos terminales figitis deo, sicut de gratia, ita de disciplina, sicut de charismatibus, ita et de sollempnibus, ut perinde officia cessaverint, quemodum et beneficia eius, atque ita negetis usque adhuc eum munia imponere, quia et hic lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem.* In the Μοντανίστου καὶ ὀρθοδόξου διάλεξις (Labriolle, *Sources*, p. 96, 5/7) the Montanist says to his opponent: Καὶ τοι γε ὑμεῖς τὰ Παύλου καταργεῖτε λέγοντες μετὰ Χριστὸν μὴ εἶναι προφήτας. For the opposite view, see *Fragm. Murator.* l. 79; Euseb. *h. e.* 5, 16, 3; 6, 20, 3; Labriolle, *Cris. Mont.*, 548; cf. also Fascher, 221 *seq.* — *consequi* is used so frequently by Christian authors in connection with baptism, grace, prophecy, Holy Spirit, and eternal life, that it may be regarded as a 'mediate Christianity'; in this context the omission of *baptisma* after *consequi* in an inscription is worth mentioning (C. I. L. X, 4488: *consecuta est d. VI*). We may also refer to the fact that Latin translations of Holy Scripture originating from Africa have a marked predilection for this verb (see von Soden, *Festg. Jülicher*, 279 and *Das Lat. N T in Afr. z. Zt. Cypr.*, 249).

4. *apud nos*, viz. among the Montanists (cf. Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, 358). — Wenn still being a catholic, Tert. fervently opposed to the coming into prominence of women in the Church. Cf. *praescr.* 41, 13/6 (according to Harnack, *Marcion*, 147, this passage refers to the Montanists, which is by no means certain): *Ipsae mulieres haereticæ, quam procaces! quæ audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, fortassean et tingere; bapt.* 1, 3; 17, 4. 5. From the Montanistic period cf. *v. v.* 9: *non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii, sortem sibi vindicare.* In *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (600, 7/11) an exception is made for prophecy: *aeque praescribens silentium mulieribus in ecclesia, ne quid discendi dumtaxat gratia loquantur* (1 Cor. 14, 34/5), — *ceterum prophetandi ius et illas habere iam ostendit, cum mulieri etiam prophetanti velamen imponit* (1 Cor. 11, 5) — *ex lege accipit* (sc. Paulus) *subiciendae feminae auctoritatem*; *ib.* (600, 23/4). For the position of women among the Montanists, see Bonwetsch, *Mont.*, 168/9. Origen (*Catena in ep. ad Cor.*, ed. Cramer (Oxford 1841), 279) still to the Montanistic prophetesses denies the right to come into prominence in the community and to prophesy. In the present passage the woman only relates her vision *dimissa plebe*; apart from the wish to examine every vision and every revelation (see the sequel), this may also have come from considerations as described in *v. v.* 9. Pamelius' assertion that Tert. should have the famous Priscilla in mind here is completely groundless and was already rejected by La Cerda. — *inter dominica sollempnia*: 'at the Sunday service'. This interpretation is also upheld by d'Alès (*Théol.*, 308. 476), Schepelern (*Der Montan. und d. phryg. Kulte*, 14), and Glaue (*Z N T W* 23 (1924), 142; cf. also Teeuwen, 117. 126), whereas according to Dölger (*A Ch* 3 (1932), 188 and 6 (1940), 108/15), the meaning is:

'at the service consecrated to the Lord'. The same expression is found in *fuga* 14, 1 (likewise belonging to the Montanistic period): '*sed quomodo colligemus*', *inquis*, '*quomodo dominica sollemnia celebrabimus?*' (for other denominations of this service in Tert.'s works, see Adam, *Kirch.*, 186). To settle this question it should firstly be observed that the service described in the next sentences does not differ from the Catholic service in any respect (it is for this reason that it was frequently denied to be Montanistic), so that the more plausible supposition is that it was a Sunday service (cf. Achelis, 1, 158/9). Moreover, it may be pointed out that, according to Apoc. 1, 10, St. John obtained his first vision at a Sunday, probably during the Sunday service (visions seem to have been frequently received during this service, cf. Weinelt, *Wirkungen des Geistes*, 224). Eventually, it should be noted that *dominicus*, though often used by Tert. in a different context (see the list drawn up by Dölger, A Ch 6, 111/2), is also used by him with reference to the Sunday (e. g. *cor.* 3, 23: *Die dominico*; *iei.* 15 (293, 19): *sabbatis et dominicis*), and that Κυριακή occurs in early times as a denomination of this same day (see Bauer's note on Ignat. *ep. ad Magn.* 9, 1, *Hdb. N. T.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 226). For further particulars about the use of *dominicus*, see Löfst., *Per.*, 76/7 and *Synt.*, 1, 93/5; Wohleb, 69; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 91/3. 96; Merckx, 23/5. — **per ecstasin**: for this notion, see the comm. on ch. 45. — **patitur**: this verb is a very appropriate expression of the Montanistic view on ecstasy, which supposed the soul to be completely passive during this state. — **conversatur eum angelis**: ὁμιλεῖ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις (Iren. 5, 35, 1: *cum sanctis angelis conversationem . . . in regno capient* is of course different). Conversations with the Lord are frequently mentioned in the acts of martyrs, e. g. *Mart. Polyc.* 2, 2: τῆς σαρκὸς ἀπεδήμουν . . . παρυστῶς ὁ κύριος ὁμιλεῖ αὐτοῖς; Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 5, 1, 56 (the martyrs of Lugdunum): μηδὲ αἰσθησιν ἔτι τῶν συμβαινόντων ἔχουσα (sc. Blandina) διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα . . . καὶ ὁμιλίαν πρὸς Χριστόν; *ib.* § 51: μήτε στενάξαντος (sc. τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου) μήτε γρούξαντός τι ὅλως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ καρδίαν ὁμιλοῦντος τῷ Θεῷ. For further particulars, see Schlier, *Unters. zu den Ignat.-Briefen*, 141; Lebreton, *Rev. d. sc. relig.* 6 (1926), 369/78; Weinelt, *Wirkungen des Geistes*, 206/7. The last-mentioned scholar also points out (*ib.*, 182) that the famous vision of Quintilla or Priscilla containing an announcement of the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem into the Phrygian city of Pepuza (Epiphan. *panar.* 49, 1, 9) must have had the form of a conversation with Christ. To these passages *Pass. Perpet.* 4, 2 (cf. Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.*, 254) may be added: *et ego, quae me sciebam fabulari cum Domino*. From Tert.'s pre-Montanistic period cf. *ad ux.* 1, 4 (here, however, visions are left out of consideration): *cum illo* (sc. deo) *vivunt* (sc. virgines), *cum illo sermocinantur*. Similarly, Hippolytus says (*refut.* p. 293, 2 Wendl.): ἔση δὲ ὁμιλητῆς Θεοῦ, and Nemesius observes (*de nat. hom.* 1 = p. 65 Matth.) that a good man ἀγγέλοις καὶ Θεῷ διαλέγεται. For the conception of prophesy as a dialogue between God and prophet, see Windisch's note on 1 Petr. 1, 10 (*Hdb. N. T.* 15, p. 54), for the *Corp. Herm.* (12, 19), Kroll, *Herm.*, 255; cf. also Bousset,

Kyrios Christos, 310₇. — *sacramenta*, viz. *arcana*, μυστήρια (see comm. on 1, 4 and 18, 3). — *quorundam corda dignoscit*: for a true prophet must be a καρδιογνώστης; cf. 15, 4: *si etiam propheta eius occulta cordis traducendo probatur*. For a discussion of the relevant passages from the N T (1 Cor. 14, 24/5; Ephes. 5, 8/14; 1 Tim. 5, 20; 2 Tim. 4, 2; Tit. 1, 9; Joh. 3, 20 and 16, 7/11), the letters of Ign. (*Phil.* 7, 2; *ad Polyc.* 1/2), and Iren. (5, 6, 1), see Weinel, *Wirkungen des Geistes*, 183/90 (Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.*, 239; Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 118₂). That the Montanists considered this ability to be a *charisma* as well, is shown by many passages from Tert. (see below) and by Euseb. *histor. eccles.* 5, 16, 9 (cf. Weinel, *op. cit.*, 188). For instances from the lives of monks, see Reitzenstein, *Histor. Monach. und Hist. Lausiaca*, 120₀; cf. also Schepelern, *Montan.*, 149/50. From Tert. we may quote *adv. Marc.* 3, 14 (400, 7), *pub.* 22 (272, 9/11), and especially *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (600, 18/20; the whole chapter shows the influence of Montanism): *exhibeat itaque Marcion dei sui dona, aliquos prophetas, qui tamen non de humano sensu, sed de dei spiritu sint locuti, qui et futura praenuntiarint et cordis occulta traduxerint*. — *medicinas desiderantibus sumit*: "she obtains directions for healing for such people as want (need) them". The reading *sumit* (*submittit* Pamelius) is also required by the clause. For *sumere* in the sense of 'to obtain', cf. e. g. c. Chr. 18, 16/7: '*Quia aliud est, quod a deo sumpsit . . .*' (clause 1); Apul. *Asclep.* 30: *immobilis aeternitas . . . ex qua omnium temporum agitatio sumit exordium*; Hilar. *trin.* 2, 6: *non aliunde quod est sumens* ('obtaining its existence'); *sumere epistolam* = *accipere ep.*, Iul. Valer. 156, 12 (Fassbender, 71). An exact parallel is furnished by *hymn. S. Severin.* 31/2: *omnis accedens salubrem medelam / sumsit ab illo*. A different use of *sumere* is found in 22, 2 (see comm.): *unde et quando et qua ratione sumatur* (sc. anima). — *prout scripturae leguntur*, etc.: the service described in this passage is regarded as a catholic one by P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. de l'Afr. chrét.*, 1, 404, H. Leclercq, *L'Afr. chrét.*, 1, 167, Klap, 128/9, and Adam, *Der Katholik*, 1908 I, 423, as a Montanistic one by Bonwetsch, *Mont.*, 186, and Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, 461. Labriolle rightly refers to the words *apud nos* and to *disserueramus* in the next sentence, which show that Tert. had preached; to this we may add the fact that Tert. never was a priest in the catholic Church, as has been demonstrated repeatedly by Koch (see Bibliography, p. 599). Moreover, it may be pointed out that the words *nam et diligentissime digeruntur, ut etiam probentur* are best explained from apologetic intentions: Tert. wants to show that in Montanistic services everything is done correctly; in the case of a catholic service he would not have drawn attention to this habit so explicitly (the word *usus* has been chosen for due reasons). Eventually, it is dubious whether such an examination would have taken place after a catholic service; and if so, if Tert. would have been present at it. — *psalmi canuntur*: see next notes. For the special psalms of the Montanists, see Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, 64/5. — *allocutiones*: 'sermons'. The opinion of Pamelius that the term *allocutiones* denotes words repeatedly uttered by the congregation, such as *Dominus vobiscum*, *Oremus*, *Sursum Corda*,

Gratias agamus Deo Domino nostro, is far from plausible, first, because *allocutiones* is not the appropriate term for these utterances, secondly, because they cannot possibly have given rise to the visions of the sister; moreover, the vision described in the present passage partly resulted from a sermon by Tert. For *allocutio* in the sense of 'sermon' Thes. I. L. I, 1691, 32 *seqq.* only quotes Tert. *praescr.* 15, 2 (probably wrongly), [Cypr.] (= Novatian.) *puđ.* 1. 14, and Marcell. *chron.* II 61, 1, 380. For more passages from Cypr., see Watson, 271, for Novat., Koch, *Novat.*, 280. At any rate, this meaning, which may have originated from the analogy of the *allocutio militum* (Thes., *loc. cit.*, I. 7/31), is found frequently enough to term it a 'Christianism' (*homilia* as a denotation of 'sermon' is not found before Hilary: Sainio, 68). — *petitiones delegantur*: *petitio* has still its original meaning in this passage and has not yet become a complete equivalent of *oratio*, as is often the case since the beginning of the fourth century (in the letters of Ignatius αἰτήσεις is sometimes already synonymous with προσευχή; see Bauer's note on *ep. ad Polyc.* 7, 1, *Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 280). That Tert. clearly distinguished two kinds of prayer, is shown by *orat.* 1 (181, 15/7): *propria . . . orationis officia . . . venerationem dei aut hominis petitionem*. For the same distinction in the works of Philo, see Völker, 332, for the N T (1 Cor. 14, 14/5), Weiszäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*², 557. — According to P. Glaue, *Z N T W* 23 (1924), 147, Tert. in this passage neglects the usual order of divine service. If so, the reason may be that Tert. is only interested here in the *materiae visionum*; we may also point to the influence of parallelism (*petitiones* at the end, to get a rhyme *delegantur-subministrantur*?) and to the circumstance that the description given in *apol.* 39, 2/3 does not follow a chronological order either. Nevertheless, it is fairly remarkable that, with the exception of the psalms, the order underlying the passage under consideration corresponds with the famous description given by Justin (*apol.* 1, 67, 3/5): καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγγωρεῖ. (4) Εἶτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νοθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. (5) Ἐπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν. If to this passage is added *Constit. apostol.* 2, 54, 1 (μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν καὶ τὴν ψαλμωδίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς γραφαῖς διδασκαλίαν), where the singing of psalms is also mentioned between the reading of Holy Scripture and the sermon, the conclusion is obvious that Tert. sticks to the usual order (in 1 Cor. 14, 26, too, the ψαλμός is followed by the διδασχῇ; cf. Weiszäcker, *Apostol. Zeit.*², 559). For the reading of Holy Scripture in Tert.'s time, see Glaue, *op. cit.*, 150/1 (*lectio selecta*; the function of *lector* not yet known), for the combination of reading and sermon, Knopf's note on 2 Clem. 19, 1 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 180), and Norden, *Kunstprosa*, 540/1. For the singing of psalms (we should not think here of such spontaneous hymns as are meant in 1 Cor. 14, 26, Col. 3, 16, and Ephes. 5, 19, for which cf. Harnack,

Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit., 1, 795 *seqq.* and T U VII 2 (1891), 46₂), see G. Rietschel in Herzog-Hauck³, 10, 401/2 and Achelis, 1, 289/90. — *nescio . . . disserueramus*: probably Tert. had discussed the corporeality of the soul, for the sister beheld the soul *corporaliter*. *Nescio quid* is to be interpreted as a rhetoric nonchalance (see comm. on 46, 5). The present passage implies that Tert. held some official function (probably that of presbyter: Achelis, 2, 46) in the community of the Montanists (cf. *iei.* 16 (295, 13); *cod. Justin.* 1, 5, 20, 3: ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνοσίοις Μοντανισταῖς θεσπίζομεν, ὥστε μηδένα συγχωρεῖσθαι τῶν καλουμένων αὐτῶν πατριαρχῶν καὶ κοινωνῶν ἢ ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων ἢ διακόνων ἢ ἄλλων κληρικῶν). For Tert.'s and Cypr.'s habit of reading their works (or parts of them) to the community, cf. e. g. Achelis, 2, 68. — *in spiritu esset*: see comm. on 8, 5. — *dimissa plebs*: *plebs* here denotes the congregation as opposed to the clergy; cf. e. g. Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 469 *seqq.*; Sainio, 50/1; Achelis, 2, 37 and 109; Watson, 257. Against this view Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.* 1, 59, observe that, if *plebs* really has this meaning, it is inexplicable that *populus*, which was always used to denote all citizens, should be so frequently found as completely equivalent to it. Though it must be granted that in some passages from Cypr. this similarity occurs indeed (for instance, *ep.* 63, 13: *Christo populus adunatur et credentium plebs ei in quem credidit copulatur et iungitur*), the contrast *plebs* — *clerus* (*praepositi*) is so much more frequent in his works that there is no reason to reject Löfstedt's explication. The relevant passages from Cypr. are also discussed by H. Janssen (*Kultur und Sprache*, 60/5), who distinguishes three meanings of *plebs*: a) 'the entire body of Christians', as opposed to God or Christ; b) 'the congregation', as opposed to the bishop; c) 'the laity', as opposed to the clergy (for the last-mentioned contrast, see also Hoogterp, 230; Goelz., *Jér.*, 232 and *Avit.*, 427; Tidn., *Did.*, 167/8). From Tert. Janssen (p. 55/7) in addition to the present passage quotes three places; in his opinion, the meaning 'laity' is only found in *exh. cast.* 7, 17/8: *Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas*, whereas the meaning 'congregation' occurs in the remaining three, viz. the present passage, *mon.* 12 (*oportebat igitur omnem communis disciplinae formam sua fronte proponi, . . . quo magis sciret plebs eum ordinem sibi observandum qui faceret praepositos*), and *iei.* 13 (291, 27: *bene autem, quod et episcopi universae plebi mandare ieiunia adsolent*). However, in *mon.* 12 the contrast *plebs* . . . *praepositi* is obvious, as in the preceding part of the chapter we frequently find *clerus*. For the passage under discussion the same meaning is to be assumed; this is also evident from the addition of *dimissa*, cf. e. g. Liv. 25, 4, 1: *plebe dimissa senatus vocatur*. The Greek equivalent of *plebs* = 'laity' is λαός (cf. e. g. Peterson, Εἰς Θεός, 179 and 318/9), whereas πληθός often means 'the organized congregation' (see Bauer's note on Ignat. *ep. ad Magn.* 6, 1 = *Hdb. N. T.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 223). — *nobis* must refer to the leaders of the community (cf. e. g. Bonwetsch in Herzog-Hauck³, 13, 426), one of whom Tert. must have been (according to Koch, *Hist. Jahrb.* 28 (1907), 101, he cannot have been a priest; he may, however, have been so in the community of the

Montanists). — **digeruntur**: of Montanistic oracles special collections existed. Theodoretus *haer. fabul.* 3, 1 mentions βίβλοι προφητικαί containing utterances of Maximilla and Priscilla, and Epiphan. *panar.* 49, 2 relates: φέρουσι (viz. the Montanists) δὲ μαρτυρίας πολλὰς παταίας (for more passages, Bonwetsch, *Mont.*, 16, and Harnack, *Gesch. altchristl. Lit.*, 238/40). Tert., too, must have known collections of this kind (Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, 86/7). That after the time of the 'great prophets' this sect retained the habit of noting down revelations (and probably also prophetic dreams), is also shown by *Pass. Perpet.* 1, 5: *Itaque et nos, qui sicut prophetias ita et visiones novas pariter repromissas et agnoscimus et honoramus, ceterasque virtutes Spiritus Sancti ad instrumentum Ecclesiae deputamus, . . . necessario et digerimus et ad gloriam Dei lectione celebramus* (cf. *ib.* 1, 1: *si vetera fidei exempla . . . in litteris sunt digesta, . . . cur non et nova documenta . . . digerantur?*). However, it is only in the passage under discussion that the examination, which takes place afterwards, is mentioned as the main motive of the notation; Labriolle, *Cris. Mont.*, 352, compares the plea made by Aug. *civ. dei* 22, 8 to note down recent miracles in authentic acts. *Digerere* in the first place denotes the arrangement of the materials, see Labriolle, *op. cit.*, 321, and Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1119, 45 *seqq.* (for the use of *digestum* in Tert., cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 75, for *digesta* as denoting Holy Scripture, *id.*, *Synt.*, 121 and Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1120, 67). For the πνευματικός's noting the details of a vision himself, see Weinel, *op. cit.*, 103/5 and Labriolle, *op. cit.*, 37, for the habit in general of noting down revelations and dreams, which in the time of Tert. was very common, G. Misch, *Gesch. der Autobiographie*, 1, 303, 315, 348/9. — **ut etiam probentur**: the necessity of examining the spirit speaking from prophets is emphasized from the NT downwards, cf. 1 Cor. 12, 3/4 and 14, 29; 1 Thessal. 5, 20/1; 1 Joh. 4, 1; Did. 11, 8/12; Ps.-Cor. ad Paul. 3; [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 21 and *homil.* 2, 6/11; Hermas *mand.* 11, 7/16. Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 5, 16, 16 informs us that a special commission was sent out to examine the prophetic spirit present in Maximilla. For the character of such examinations, see Lietzmann, *G. A. K.*, 2, 46; Schepelern, *Montan.*, 132/3; H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des hl. Geistes*³, 35 *seqq.* From Tert. cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 21 (318, 14/5): *quod* (sc. prophetes) *si Marcion poterit dici, debebit etiam probari*. — **repromitteret**: as an equivalent of *promittere* the verb *repromittere*, for which see Kroll's note on Cic. *Brut.* 18, is very frequent in the works of Tert., probably through the influence of juridical Latin (see Koffmane, 58 and Rönisch, *Sem.*, 3, 73), but also on account of the clausula. — **lucida et aerii coloris**: the reading *aerii* is warranted by the quotation of this passage by Augustine (see the *adnot. crit.*). Similar details are frequently found in descriptions of the outward appearance of the soul, e. g. Prud. *Hamart.* 887/9: *una animas semper facies habet et color unus/aëris*; *ib.* 867 *seqq.*; *perist.* 10, 438: *animae liquor*; *Transit. Mariae VII (VIII) (Apocal. apocr. ed. Tischendorf, p. 129)*: *viderunt autem apostoli animam eius tanti candoris esse ut nulla mortalium lingua digne possit effari: vincebat enim omnem candorem*

nivis et universi metalli et argenti radiantis magna luminis claritate. For the πνευματικός and αὐγοειδής χίτων of the soul in the so-called Chaldaic oracles, see Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 48 (§ 205), for Psellus, *ib.*, 49/50. For *per omnia* (from Livy and Quint. downwards), see Hand, *Tursellinus*, 4, 447; Wölfflin, *A. L. L.* 5, 144; Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 80. — ‘... Hoc visio.’ Et deus: by this punctuation it seems possible to retain the reading given by A. *Hoc visio* is more in accordance with Tert.’s style than *Haec visio*; cf. e. g. § 6: *hoc erit anima*. The repetition of *et* emphasizes the importance of the assertion; Tert. for this very reason frequently connects two equivalent notions by *et . . . et* (see the Index verborum, p. 74). — *idoneus*: a law term (*testis idoneus*, e. g. *dig.* 22, 5, 6. 9. 10; cf. *Thes. l. L.* VII, 1: 234, 11/6). From Tert. cf. *apol.* 21, 26: *idoneos testes Christi*; *pat.* 15 (22, 14); *cor.* 4, 25; *c. Chr.* 17, 3; *ad nat.* 2, 8, 4; *adv. Iud.* 1, 15; *res.* 32 (71, 3); *apol.* 20, 3. — *tunc et si*: this reading, which is given by A, is rightly defended by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 85/6). For *credas* he refers to 10,5: *hoc magis credas, si . . .*, and *fuga* 3, 2: *credas utique, si . . .* (here Thierry writes *credes*, which is a conjecture by Borleffs); cf. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 25 (505, 9); for *tunc si*, see 27, 3; *res.* 3 (29, 8). *Res ipsa* of course refers to the vision, which deserves to find credence, firstly because the occurrence of visions as *charismata* is warranted by Holy Scripture, secondly on account of the plausibility of its details (viz. the ‘airy’ colour and the human shape of the soul).

5. *enim*: common sense also admits that the soul, on account of its corporality, must have some colour, more exactly an ‘airy’ one, and so bears out the plausibility of the vision. Similarly, in § 7 the second detail, viz. the *forma per omnia humana*, is proved to be acceptable to reason. — *inter illa . . . proinde et*: though the use of *proinde* and *perinde* frequently leads to contaminations in Tert.’s works (for instances, see Thörn., *Eran.* 16 (1916), 123/4), it is not necessary to assume that such is the case in this passage, as for Tert. *inter illa* is completely equivalent to *sicut illa*; cf. comm. on 42, 2: . . . *hominem, in quo inter omnia* (= *sicut omnia*) *finiendo et ipsa finitur* (sc. mors). — *coloris proprietas*: this assertion may partly have been borrowed from Plato *Phaedr.* 247 C. The words probably mean: “the peculiarity of possessing a colour” (cf. 16, 7; 36, 2: *esset etiam sexus proprietatem alteri substantiae adscribere*), though they may also be equivalent to *color proprius*, as is certainly the case in *pall.* 3, 3: *cum illi* (sc. chamaeleonti) *coloris proprietas una* (= *unus proprius color*) *sit*. The former interpretation is supported by § 2: *Quid nunc, quod et effigiem animae damus . . . ?* — *omni corpori*: an insertion of *ut* before these words, as proposed by Gomperz, is superfluous, because, as Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 23) has shown, Tert. once more gives an incomplete syllogism; after *omni corpori* the words *et inde etiam animae quam corpus esse demonstravimus* should be added. — *non ut*: ‘not in the sense that . . .’ (cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 51/3). — The subsequent note must be traced back to Soranus. This passage was rightly explained by Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 209/10) in the following way: Aenesidemus, who frequently

καθ' ὑπόθεσιν adopted views which had been (or might have been) taken by Heraclitus (cf. Überweg-Prächter, 582), in Heraclitus' statement that the soul, which enters the body through breathing, comes from the περιέχον (Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 7, 129), regarded τὸ περιέχον as equivalent to ἀήρ (for this interpretation of τὸ περιέχον Diels refers to Anaxagoras frag. B 2; we may also quote Anaximenes' words (Aët. 1, 3, 4): οἶον . . . ὅλον τὸν κόσμον πνεῦμα καὶ ἀήρ περιέχει; afterwards this denotation of the air becomes a common one, cf. e. g. Arist. *de iuv. et senect.* 6 = 470 a 21; Diog. Laërt. 9, 9; [Hippocr.] *de victu* 9). Soranus (or perhaps already the redactor of the *Vetusta Placita*) wrongly regarded views ascribed to Αἰνῆσιδῆμος καθ' Ἡρακλείτον as adhered to by both Aenesidemus and Heraclitus (cf. also the notes on 14, 5 and 25, 2). — **Anaximeni:** cf. Aët. 1, 3, 4. — **secundum quosdam et Heraclito:** that, through the intermediary of Soranus, this note derives from a Sceptic source (*Vetusta Placita* < *Aenesidemus*), is evident from Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 9, 360: Ἀρχέλαος . . . καὶ κατ' ἐνίους Ἡράκλειτος ἀέρα (sc. ἔλεξε πάντων εἶναι ἀρχὴν καὶ στοιχεῖον). Cf. also the note on 17, 2, and for the doubt on Heraclitus' views in general, e. g. Aristot. *metaphys.* 3, 3 (1005b 23): ἀδύνατον γὰρ ὄντινόν ταῦτον ὑπολαμβάνειν εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι, καθάπερ τινὲς οἰοῦνται λέγειν Ἡράκλειτον (Diels Vors., Heracl., frag. A 7). — **Heraclidi:** Aët. 4, 3, 6: Ἡ. φωτισθεῖς τὴν ψυχὴν ὥρῃσατο (Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 5, 18; Philopon. *de anim.* p. 4 = DDG, 214; Macrobi. *somn. Scip.* 1, 14, 19); see also Rohde, *Psyche* 2⁹/10, 320₁.

6. cerauniis: this exemple has been borrowed from Plin. *n. h.* 37, 134: *est inter candidas* (sc. gemmas) *et quae ceraunia vocatur, fulgorem siderum rapiens* (Solin. 20, 15; Isidor. *orig.* 16, 13, 5). From Tert. cf. also *cult. fem.* 1, 1, 3 and for *ignito*, Claudian. *Laus Serenae* 78: *igneae . . . ceraunia*; Sidon. Apollin. *carm.* 5, 50: *fulminis . . . lapidem*; Hier. *ep.* 130, 7, 13: *cerauniorum flammis*. For further details, see Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 143/4. — **ignita:** this adjunct. is found from Apul. and Gell. downwards (however, cf. Serv. auct. *ad Verg. ecl.* 6, 33: *aetheris quem Cicero ignitum liquorem dixit*), the verb *ignire* from Cypr. *adv. Fortun.* 11 (339, 1 H.) downwards. — **berullis:** Plin. *n. h.* 37, 76: *probatissimi ex iis sunt qui viriditatem maris puri imitantur*. I adopt the orthography given by A, as it is also found in Plin., *loc. cit.*, and Iuven. 5, 38. For the epithet *aquosa*, cf. also Epiphan. *de XII gemm.* 11: γλαυκίζων μὲν εἶδει, θαλαττοβαφής; Marbod. *de gemmis* 12: *b. lymphae marinae similes*. See Blümner, art. 'Beryllus', R. E. III: 320/1 (Prop. 4, 3, 52: *crystallus . . . aquosa*). — **colato = puro**, as in 48, 1: *colatiora somniari*, and in *ad nat.* 1, 5, 3: *serenitas . . . colata*; Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Levit.* 9, 8. As an equivalent of *purgare* the verb *colare* occurs in 53, 6 and *res.* 61 (122, 19). — **quanta = quot**, is found for the first time in Prop. 1, 5, 10, and does not reappear until in Stat. (Hofm., *Synt.*, 491; Lfst., *Per.*, 147 and *Synt.*, 2, 43; for Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 106). — **color . . . dissociat:** 32, 9: *duritia* (sc. lapidis et ferri) *communicat, substantia discordat*.

Cf. the discussion of these two passages by J. F. Bethune-Baker (Journ. of Theol. Stud. 4 (1903), 441), who rightly points out that the resemblance of the present passage to the sentence from ch. 32 is "merely superficial"; *natura* does not denote here the *substantia*, but the "sum total of the attributes or properties of a thing". For further particulars, see the same author, *The meaning of Homocousios in the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed* (Texts and Studies VII 1, 1901), 15/24 and 65/70; Esser, 57 *seqq.*; Stier, 71/7; for the correspondence of *substantia* and *materia* (*substantia ignita . . . aquosa materia*), see Schlossmann, *Ztschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 27 (1906), 410/1. — *aemulum*: see comm. on 2, 5. — *sed quoniam*: a combination frequently found in Tert's works; see Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 68. — *tradux*: 'vine-tendril', is often used metaphorically by Tert. (some instances are given by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 177/8 and by Bindley in his note on *praescr.* 20, 20). Whereas in *ad nat.* 1, 7, 5 he still writes in *traduces quodammodo linguarum et aurium*, he omits *quodammodo* in the parallel passage found in *apol.* 7, 12; cf. also *ib.* 9, 17 and 21, 12; *pat.* 5 (7, 18); *ad nat.* 1, 12, 11; c. *Chr.* 9, 13 and 20, 34. 38. For *spiritus tradux*, cf. *scorp.* 9 (162, 28/9): *cum propagine nominis, cum traduce spiritus sancti*. *Tradux* refers to heredity in general in c. *Chr.* 22, 9/10: *caro ipsa Abrahae et David, per singulos traducem sui faciens*; in connection with Tert.'s special theory of 'traducianism' it is used in 36, 4: *si non ut carnis, ita et animae ex Adam tradux fuisset in femina*; *res.* 7 (34, 21); *test. anim.* 3 (138, 5/7): (homo) *in mortem datus exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum suae etiam damnationis traducem fecit*. It is very remarkable that Tert. never uses this word to denote the *semen animae* (in 36, 4 there is no question of a *semen*). In later times *tradux* is frequently used in this context; for Ambrosiast. and [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, see Souter, *Stud.*, 145. The influence of Tert. may be observed in Prudentius' statement, *Apoth.* 915/6: *vitandus tamen error erit, ne traduce carnis/transfundi in subolem credatur fons animarum*. For the definition of the soul as *spiritus tradux*, see comm. on ch. 11. — For *prae*, see the note on 2, 2, for *de*, on § 2.

7. *de sensu iam tuo*: an appeal to common sense (see comm. on § 5 and 2, 1); cf. *mon.* 3: *de suo, id est de humano sensu*; *adv. Prax.* 23 (273, 6/7): *ipse de suo sensu*. — *circumtulit*: cf. comm. on 8, 3. — *Hoc nos sapere . . . inducat*: instead of *nos* (B Gel) A has *nobis*. The reading given by B seems to be preferable, firstly because it is the *lectio difficilior*, secondly because it is more in accordance with the idiom of Tert., in whose works *inducere* (just as the Greek verb εἰσφέρειν, and probably through its influence) frequently lies midway between the meanings 'to introduce' and 'to teach'. Cf. e. g. 12, 3: *non poterit animus impassibilis induci*; *adv. Herm.* 41 (170, 14/5): *cum enim vis materiam nec bonam nec malam inducere*; *ib.* 45 (176, 5/6): *talem . . . qualis inducitur* (sc. *materia*); *ib.* 30 (159, 1. 9) and 36 (166, 15); *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (389, 1/2): *qui ipsum deum eius nec auctorem carnis induxerat nec resuscitatorem*; *ib.* 3, 9 (390, 22) and 5, 20 (647, 15);

mon. 7; perhaps also *an.* 23, 1: *ut Saturninus . . . induxit* (at all events, this passage is not to be put on a level with such places as *praescr.* 6, 20/1: *Apelles . . . novam haeresin induxit*, and *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 = 292, 5). Just as in the passage under discussion, *inducere* is connected with two accusatives in *adv. Val.* 11 (190, 2/3): *Christi erat inducere Aeonas naturam coniugiorum* (instead of *inducere* Junius proposed to read *enim docere*; from the same chapter cf. *ll.* 8/9 *docebantur*, *l.* 17 *edocuit*); cf. also *ib.* *ll.* 17/9: *ut . . . veram inducerentur quietem*. Moreover, we may refer to Ambrosiast. *in ep. ad Rom.*, praef.: *qui male inducti statim correcti sunt . . . quia docti bene facile transducti fuerunt*, and to the similar construction of *erudire* and *instruere* in Tert.'s works: *adv. Marc.* 2, 16 (356, 14/5): *deum nos a prophetis et a Christo . . . erudimur*; *pat.* 3 (3, 16); *pall.* 3, 7 (cf. *Thes. I. L. V.*, 2: 830, 71/5); *iei.* 7 (283, 13/4): *et ordinem et significationem somnii per omnia instruitur* (for further details on *instruere*, see C. F. W. Müller, *Nom. u. Akk.*, 146; Souter, *Stud.*, 114; Werner, 69; we may add Hier. *comm. in Ps.* 111 (Anecd. Maredsol. III, 1: 82, 3/4): (psalmus) *mores nos instruens*). Cf. also Salv. *de gub. dei* 6 (132, 4 Pauly): *hoc nos Christus imbuit* (see Rochus, 68). — *interim*: 'provisionally'; see Waltz., *Ét.*, 178. — *primordii*: "the original situation <, as described in Genesis>". Tert. frequently refers to the first chapters of Genesis, which he believes to contain numerous *exempla* for the present state of things; cf. 16, 1; 26, 5; 27, 7; 31, 1; 36, 4; 43, 9; *mon.* 5: *primordiorum testimonium*; see also the Introduction, ch. IV. — *Recogita*: in a similar context this imperative is found in 27, 2: *recogita enim de novissimis prima*, and in *apol.* 48, 5: *recogita quid fueris, antequam esses*. — *totus* (A) is rightly defended by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 31): "Nam hoc quidem, quod totus homo in animam factus, i. e. anima (= divino flatu) impletus esse intelligitur, maxime pertinet ad id demonstrandum, quod h. l. efficere vult, scilicet animam omni intus linea corporis expressam esse itaque corporis effigiem exhibere". In this context Thörnell quotes several passages where Tert. adds a further explication by means of *utique*, e. g. 3, 4: *'et flavit . . . in animam vivam'*, *utique ex dei flatu*; 6, 3; *adv. Marc.* 4, 15 (466, 15); *bapt.* 12, 8; 19, 2; see also *comm.* on 24, 3: *memoria scilicet*. — *intus* of course has the function of an adject. (cf. the note on 1, 2, *anima tunc Socratis*). The words *omni intus linea* probably mean: 'the whole interior outline', i. e. 'the whole inside of the surface'. Unfortunately Tert. does not say explicitly how he conceives of the presence of the soul in the body. The most probable supposition is that (through the intermediary of Soranus) he follows the example of the Stoics and assumes a complete *μῆτις* of body and soul; this explanation is also suggested by his energetic refutation (at the end of ch. 6) of the thesis that two bodies cannot be in the same place. Cf. also *res.* 7 (35, 27 sqq.): *collocavit autem — an potius inseruit et inmiscuit* (sc. animam) *carni? tanta quidem concretione, ut incertum haberi possit, utrumne caro animam an carnem anima circumferat*. See for this question, Rauch, 27/9. — *et velut in forma gelasse*: this passage has influenced Vincentius Victor, as is shown by Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 4, 20, 33: *animam dicis per cuncta*

membra diffusam gelando riguisse, et a vertice usque ad ima vestigia, a medullis intimis usque ad superficiem cutis (cf. Tert. *omni intus linea*), *totam totius accepisse corporis formam*; *ib.* 4, 21, 34: *gelata illa forma, sicut putas, animae tuae*; the most important passage is found *ib.* 4, 14, 20: *sed sicut te scripsisse video, interiorem hominem animam dicis* (cf. Tert. § 8). *de hac enim loquebaris, cum diceris: 'Et gelante substantia quae comprehendere non poterat, efficeret corpus aliud intra corpus naturae suae vi et spiramine conglobatum, exindeque inciperet homo interior apparere, quem veluti in forma vaginae corporalis inclusum, ad similitudinem sui delineavit exterioris hominis habitudo'*. *deinde infers: 'flatus ergo dei animam fecit, immo flatus ex deo anima factus est, effigiata substantialis, et secundum naturam suam corporea, et sui corporis similis, imaginique conformis'*. Similarly, Tert. in *res.* 9 (37, 30) calls the soul *adflatus* (sc. dei) . . . *vaginam* (cf. *c. Chr.* 24, 29/31: *et illi erubescant qui adfirmant carnem in caelis vacuum sensu ut vaginam exempto Christo sedere*). The qualification of the body as *vagina animae* is also found in Plin. *n. h.* 7, 174 (see comm. on ch. 44). More frequently it is described as an ἀγγεῖον τῆς ψυχῆς, which idea derives from the Stoics (see S. Blankert, *Seneca* (ep. 90) *over natuur en cultuur en Posidonius als zijn bron* (Amsterdam 1940), 161); cf. e. g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 22, 52; Varro in *Aug. civ. dei* 7, 5; Philo *de somn.* 1, 26; *de migrat. Abrah.* 193; *quod deter. pot. insid.* 170; Dio Chrysost. 12, 404; M. Aurel. 3, 3; 10, 38; Herm. Trismeg. in Stob. *ecl.* I: 464, 8 Wachsm.; Psell. 1140 A. For σκεῦος τῆς ψυχῆς, see comm. on 40, 3: *ut suppellex*. A similar comparison is found in [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 23, 2 (50, 2/6 Souter); it is especially remarkable, as the author does not believe in the corporeality of the soul: *cum enim omnia membra implet* (sc. anima) *corporis, figurata dicitur in corpore et sicut aqua, cum sit sine effigie, missa tamen in vas figurata videtur, ita et anima, cum sit natura incorporea et simplex, quasi formatur in corpus singula membra vivificans*. To my knowledge, Tert.'s purely materialistic conception of the body-like shape of the soul is only shared by his imitator Vincentius Victor. Gregory of Nyssa, who assumes the materiality of the soul to a certain degree (see Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 258, 272, 274), is far from being as consistent as Tert.

8. *ex impressione*: B Gel have *expressione*, whereas Reifferscheid proposes to read *ex expressione*. At all events, it is necessary to retain the preposition on account of the preceding words *ex densatione*. Between *expressione* and *impressione* it is not easy to decide. The former reading is supported by § 7: *flatum . . . omni intus linea expressum esse, quam densatus impleverat*. The alternative is defended by Thörnell who writes (*Stud. Tert.* 2, 31): "*Sed rursus scripturae cod. Agobardini (viz. ex impressione) ex vocabulo impleverat suppetit adminiculum. Quippe eo ipso, quod flatus ille divinus in corpus est impressus, singulas intus lineas densatus implevit itaque illis expressus est, ut non minus recte dicatur animae effigies ex impressione esse formata quam expressione*"; as a parallel he quotes 25, 2: *isti, qui praesumunt non in utero concipi animam . . . sed et effuso iam partu*

nondum vivo infanti extrinsecus inprimi; accordingly, after *ex impressione* he understands the words *in corpus* ("anima in corpus imprimitur"), not *in corpore*. In refutation of this interpretation we may point out that, just as in this connection *solidare* is prior to *formare*, the *densatio* must precede the *ex-* or *impressio* (at least as to the sense; practically the two actions are simultaneous): in consequence of the continuous breathing by God the *flatus* becomes a concrete substance, and consequently gets its shape (cf. the preceding sentence: *densatum . . . expletum*); if, however, we adopt Thörnell's explanation, we are obliged to suppose the *impressio* to be prior to both the *densatio* and the *formatio*. So it seems impossible to retain the words *ex impressione* on account of this interpretation; yet this reading may be defended by paraphrasing "*flatus omni intus linea imprimitur*": an excellent parallel is furnished by Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 4, 14, 20: *forma quae impressa illi (sc. animae) est vel expressa de corpore*. — *Hic erit homo interior*: the same interpretation of ὁ ἑσω ἀνθρώπος (Rom. 7, 22; 2 Cor. 4, 16; Ephes. 3, 16) is given by Vincentius Victor (see comm. on § 7); besides, this is the usual exegesis, see Behm, Theol. Wörterb. zum N T, 2, 696/7, and Lietzmann's note on 2 Cor. 4, 16 = *Hdb. N. T.* 9, p. 117; we may also refer to *Did. apost.* 74, 18 Hauler: *interior homo, quod est animale*, and Pelag. in Rom. 7, 22 (*rationabilis et intelligibilis anima*). For Clem. Alex., who takes these words to refer to the νοῦς only, see Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 411, for Origen, *ib.*, 418₁, for Marcion, Harnack, 395₁* and 398*; cf. also Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und das N T.*, 115 seqq. The sentence under consideration is quoted by Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 25, 41 after the following introductory remark: *item cum animae etiam colorem daret aerium ac lucidum, ventum est ad sensus quibus eam membratim quasi corpus instruere conatus est, et ait: 'hic erit . . . fungitur'*. This quotation is important for the constitution of the text; it reads *cogitationibus* (A; *cogitatibus* B Gel.), *populus* (A B Gel; *Paulus* Urs. Rig.), and *dominum* (B Gel, *dño* A) From the subsequent refutation (*loc. cit.* 42/3) the following sentences are worth mentioning: *Ecce quibus auribus et quibus oculis debuit audire et videre deum populus, quibus anima in somnis fungitur: cum si ipsum Tertullianum quisquam videret in somnis, nunquam se diceret ab eo visum, et cum eo locutum, quem vicissim ipse non vidisset. Postremo si anima se ipsam videt in somnis, cum iacentibus utique uno loco membris corporis sui ipsa per varias imagines evagatur, quas videt, quis eam vidit aliquando in somnis aërii coloris ac lucidi, nisi forte ut cetera quae similiter falso videt?* — **dupliciter unus**: this may be a term borrowed from Christology, cf. e. g. Aug. *enchir.* 10, 35: *ac per hoc et minor est factus* (sc. Christus) *et mansit aequalis, utrumque unus, sicut dictum est*. — et ille: the pleonastic use of *ille* is particularly frequent in Vergil's works; cf. Kühn-Stegm., 1, § 118, 11/2; Lenchantin de Gubernatis' note on [Verg.] *Ciris* 188; J. Samuelsson, *Eran.* 8 (1908), 49/76. — **oculos . . . suos**: cf. ch. 7. — **populus** is equivalent to *Israel*; for more instances, see the passages collected by Kroym., *Quaest. Tert.*, 104, e. g. *idol.* 3 (33, 5/6): *nisi parum idololatriam populus admisit, quia simulacrum*

vituli et non hominis sibi consecravit; cf. also *an.* 15, 4. Ursinus assumed an allusion to 2 Cor. 12, 2/4, and hence proposed to read *Paulus* instead of *populus*. Kroymann refers to Ies. 6, 10: *excaeca cor populi huius, et aures eius aggrava: et oculos eius claude, ne forte videat oculis suis, et auribus suis audiat*; we may rather quote Jer. 5, 21 (Matth. 13, 14/5): *audi popule stulte, qui non habes cor: qui habentes oculos non videtis, et aures, et non auditis*. For the use of λαός = Ἰσραήλ in LXX and N T, see Strathmann, *Theol. Wörterb. zum N T*, 4, 34/7 and 51/3. The reading *dominum*, given by B and Augustine, is certainly the correct one; Tert. does not mean that Israel was not obedient to God, but that it did not hear him. — *debuerat*: the plusquamperf., which is used instead of the imperfect (see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 39/40) and emphasizes the remoteness of the event, also shows that the conjecture by Ursinus is wrong. — *cogitationibus* (A Aug) is to be retained, though *cogitatus* (*cogitatus* B Gel), which is found from *It.* and Apul., perhaps already from Frontin. *strateg.* 2, 5, 30, downwards, is much more frequent in Tert.'s works; in *de an.* it occurs twice in 58, 6. — *per quos . . . utitur . . . fungitur*: the absolute use of *fungor* is found from Lucr. 1, 441. 443 downwards; from Tert. we may quote *res.* 14 (44, 5) and *adv. Marc.* 4, 9 (442, 7), perhaps also *an.* 19, 3 and 27, 5. The same use of *utor* is more common. — *in somniis* (A B) must be retained on account of the clausula (2 δ); likewise in 46, 9 (2 γ δ) and 56, 2 (id.). *In somnis* instead of *in somniis* is found in all periods of the Latin language; cf. Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 50/3 and Heinze, *Lucr.* III, 116/7. — *diviti . . . Abrahæ*: see comm. on ch. 7. — *animæ martyrum sub altari*: cf. 8, 5. Tert. refers to Apoc. 6, 9: Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν πέμπτην σφραγίδα, εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον. By the θυσιαστήριον the author of the Apocalypse means the heavenly altar of God; he represents the souls of the martyrs as lying under this altar (for similar conceptions in Judaic literature, see Lohmeyer, *Die Offenb. des Joh.* (*Hdb. N. T.* IV 4), p. 200), because the martyrs were regarded as a sacrifice offered to God (2 Tim. 4, 6; Phil. 2, 7; Ignat. *ad Rom.* 2, 2; see Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, 60). According to Tert., the souls of the martyrs ascend to heaven immediately after death (see comm. on ch. 55); so he regards the *altare*, just as the *sinus Abrahæ*, as a definite region in paradise. Cf. 55, 4: *Et quomodo Iohanni in spiritu paradisi regio revelata, quæ subicitur altari, nullas alias animas apud se præter martyrum ostendit?*; see also *scorp.* 12 (173, 25 seqq.); *res.* 25 (61, 4/7); 38 (80, 28 seqq.); *orat.* 5 (184, 12/3). For the connection of this view with the custom of burying martyrs under altars, see Jos. Braun, *Der christl. Altar*, 1, (Munich 1924), 659; we may especially refer to Prud. *perist.* 3, 211/4: *sic venerari ossa libet/ossibus altar et inpositum, illa (sc. Eulalia) dei sita sub pedibus/prospicit hæc, etc.* *Sinus Abrahæ* and *ara dei* are found combined in Hier. *adv. Vigil.* 6: *ais enim vel in sinu Abrahæ, vel in loco refrigerii, vel subter aram dei animas apostolorum et martyrum consedissee*. This passage was used again by Vincentius Victor; cf. the refutation by Augustine, *de anim. et ei. orig.* 4, 21, 34: *ista itaque*

omnia si sapienter accipimus, quamvis dicamus visa veracia, non tamen vera dicimus corpora. For a different interpretation of Apoc. 6, 9, which is found in *Carm. adv. Marcionit.* 4, 132: *inque typum terrae facta ara traditur esse*, see Ch. Müller, *Unters. zum Carm. adv. Marcionit.*, 96. — *configurata*: with a dat. this verb, which occurs from Colum. 4, 20, 1 downwards, is not found before Tert. (also *adv. Val.* 1 (178, 1) and *pud.* 9 (238, 20); in 34, 4 it is connected with a final dat. of the gerundive). — *condicionis istius*, i. e. the circumstance that the soul has a definite shape (cf. § 1: *haec condicio proprietatis*): the preceding *configurata* once more reminds the reader of the *figura animae*, which is the main subject of this chapter. The reading given by B Gel, viz. *conditionis*, is far from plausible; the only possible interpretation would be: ‘<single> created thing’ (of this meaning a few instances may be quoted, e. g. *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 5: *dei conditio est et tus et merum et ignis*; perhaps *scorp.* 13 (175, 12/3; = Rom. 8, 39): *neque profundum neque alia conditio* (A; κτίσις, Vulg. *creatura*); moreover, cf. *It. Iac.* 1, 18 (cod. ff): *primitiae conditionum eius* (κτισμάτων, Vulg. *creaturae*); Hilar. *de trin.* 6, 18: *unigenitus condicionibus* (l. *conditionibus*) *et facturis ceteris praestantior*; *ib.* 9, 69; Didym. *de spir. sanct.* 8; see also Debrunner in *Festschrift für Andreas*, 17. 31). However, *conditio* in this sense would rather refer to the *substantia animae* than to a special quality of it.

10. *The life-breath (spiritus) should not be separated from the soul.*

“The soul, though manifesting itself in many ways, as to its substance is simple and uniform (§ 1). Yet some philosophers assert that it contains another natural substance, viz. the life-breath (*spiritus*); they urge us to distinguish life, which is based on the soul, from breathing, which comes from the life-breath. In support of their thesis they refer to certain animals which are said to live without breathing, because they lack lungs and windpipes (§ 2).

In refutation of this view we may begin by observing that it is unwarranted to draw conclusions concerning the human soul from the nature of gnats and ants. For every kind of living beings God created special vital organs; hence, whatever applies to a gnat, does not yet apply to man (§ 3). — Moreover, nobody can assert with absolute certainty that special kinds of animals really lack these organs. An anatomist such as Herophilus did not even possess a complete knowledge of the human body, the more so as death had already altered the bodies examined by him (§ 4). Yet philosophers assert that gnats, ants, and moths do not possess lungs and windpipes. However, it is equally impossible to perceive the eyes, jaws, etc. of such animals: nevertheless these organs exist, for God, the great artist, is the creator of both great and minute things (§ 3). — If, on the other hand, it is supposed that the creative genius of God cannot work in bodies so small, we may defend his greatness on the very ground that to these animals he made life possible without giving them the necessary organs; thus they are capable of seeing without eyes, etc., just as

the serpents move forward without feet (§ 6). But if this is possible, it is also possible to breathe without lungs and windpipes, and in that case the entire argument collapses; for then all animals may be said to draw breath, either with, or without, special organs, and consequently the life-breath is not a special substance added to the soul.

Moreover, if 'to breathe' means 'to drive out breath', and living and breathing are different, 'to live' must mean 'not to drive out breath'. But not driving out breath is proper to the dead; so driving out breath is proper to the living. Now, as this is also proper to all beings which breathe, breathing is proper to the living. Consequently, living and breathing are identical. From this it may be concluded that both living and breathing are proper to the very substance to which living is proper, i. e. the soul (§ 7). Moreover, soul and life-breath are inseparable, and hence are not two separate substances (§ 8). "However, they may be two substances, which have grown together". But if living and breathing are different, these two substances cannot possibly have grown together; and if no difference is assumed anyhow, it is more natural to assume one substance, and to say that the soul is life-breath (*spiritus*) in the same way as the day is light <: in neither case the two notions are completely identical, for> there are more kinds of *spiritus* than the life-breath, just as there are more kinds of light than the day-light. But as the day owes its existence to the light which adds itself to it, so the soul does to the *spiritus*, and thus we are justified in calling the soul *spiritus* (§ 9)".

The argument is divided into two parts. In the first part (§§ 2/7a) Tert. refutes the belief that the life-breath is a separate substance acceding to the soul, which view is based on the assertion that certain animals do not possess respiratory organs. It may be summed up in this way: "I. A. If *anima* = *spiritus*, whatever lives, must also breathe. B. Many living animals do not breathe. C. So *anima* is not = *spiritus*". The minor premiss is the outcome of the following syllogism: "II. A. For the function of breathing respiratory organs are indispensable. B. Many animals do not possess respiratory organs. C. So many animals do not breathe".

The refutation by Tert. is constructed like this:

"a) It is unwarranted to draw conclusions concerning the human organism from the nature of animals (§ 3; the same argument is found in 15, 6; here Tert. contests that I C may be concluded from I B).

b) It is impossible to say that there are animals without respiratory organs (§§ 4/5; directed against II B):

α) anatomy is not capable of furnishing unquestionable data concerning this question (§ 4).

β) in minute animals other organs, too, are frequently imperceptible to us, but this does not yet mean that they should be missing (§ 5).

c) God is able to make every function possible without the corresponding organs (§§ 6/7a), so it is also possible to breathe without respiratory organs (directed against II A). Hence we cannot say that there are animals which do not breathe, and the argument for the assertion that living and breathing are different functions, collapses (§ 7a)".

In the second part (§§ 7b/9) Tert. first demonstrates (by means of several sophisms, see comm. on this passage) that living and breathing are identical (§ 7b), and next that soul and life-breath are inseparable (§ 8). After rejecting the possibility of their being two substances which have grown together, he eventually by means of an analogy shows how the statement that "the soul is not different from the *spiritus*" should be understood: the two notions are not completely identical, for there are more kinds of *spiritus* than the life-breath, and in the case of the soul we have only to do with the last-mentioned substance; but as the soul owes its being the principle of life to the fact that the life-breath 'accedes to it', it may indeed be said to be the life-breath, for "a thing is the same as that to which its owes its existence" (§ 9).

The identity of soul and life-breath was a doctrine of the Stoics, as is evident from Chalcid. *comm.* 220 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 879): *Chrysippus 'una et eadem', inquit, 'certe respiramus et vivimus. spiramus autem naturali spiritu, ergo etiam vivimus eodem spiritu. vivimus autem anima, naturalis ergo spiritus anima esse invenitur'*. This is also apparent from the example of a syllogism with only one premiss given by Antipater (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 249): ἀναπνεῖς · ζῆς ἄρα. It may be assumed that Tert. became acquainted with this doctrine through the intermediary of Soranus (the same view is held by Karpp, p. 44). As to the sources of the refutation, a decision is more difficult.

The first part is dominated by the sentence: *pleraque enim vivere solummodo, non etiam spirare, eo quod non habeant organa spiritus, pulmones et arterias*. As is evident from § 5, the animals meant by Tert. are insects. Here Tert. interferes in a question discussed from Aristotle downwards, viz. whether insects are capable of breathing or not; whoever held the latter view, implicitly admitted that living and breathing are different. A clear account, which must have been known to Tert., is found in Pliny *n. h.* 11, 5/6: *insecta multi negarunt spirare, idque ratione persuadentes, quoniam viscera inter et ora nexus spirabilis non inesset. itaque vivere ut fruges arboresque, sed plurimum interesse spiret aliquid an vivat... nec spirare ea quibus pulmo desit. unde numerosa quaestionum series exoritur. (6) idem enim et vocem esse his negant in tanto murmure apium, cicadarum sono, et quae alia suis aestimabuntur locis. nam mihi contuenti se persuasit rerum natura nihil incredibile existimare de ea. nec video, cur magis possint non trahere animam talia et vivere quam spirare sine visceribus*. Since Tert. borrows details from Pliny in many other passages (for instance in the contemporary treatise *de pallio*, but also in this chapter), it is not quite impossible that he should have followed Pliny in connecting the controversy concerning insects with the discussion of the relation between soul and life-breath. At all events, the statement that breathing may be possible without respiratory organs must have been taken from this source, for Pliny explicitly represents this possibility as having been thought out by himself. This supposition induces us to conclude that this subject was not discussed in detail by Soranus.

Yet certain parts of the refutation have almost certainly been drawn from this authority, viz. the attack on anatomy (see comm. on § 4), and probably also the remark that we are not warranted to conclude anything concerning human beings from the nature of animals; this argument recalls the first *τρόπος* of the Sceptics, viz. *παρὰ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ζώων* (Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 40), which may quite well have been used by an adherent of the methodical school. Since the text of Pliny (note the infin. *interesse*) suggests that others, too, connected the difference between living and breathing with the discussion of insects, and since Soranus, if he mentioned the relevant doctrine of Chrysippus, must also have discussed it, the most plausible solution seems to be that Tert. in this passage follows Soranus, but also consulted Pliny, from whom he borrowed the last argument which he advances. The statement occurring in § 6 that the creation of insects is not unworthy of God, has come from Tert.'s polemics against Marcion.

In the second part of the refutation Tert. seems to be more independent. The highly sophistic argument in § 7, the appeal to common sense in § 8, and the assertion *Ipsium est enim quid, per quod est quid*, which was clearly invented for the occasion, may with good reason be ascribed to Tert. himself. An exception is perhaps to be made for the comparison of the relation between soul and *spiritus* with that between day and light (see comm. on § 9). At all events, the supposition that Tert., after following his sources, in the second part of the chapter brings forth arguments thought out by himself, is in perfect accordance with the situation found in numerous other chapters; in this connection the prefaces to ch. 6, 7, 9, 17, 18, 19, 25, 27, and 43 may be referred to.

1. *simplicem . . . secundum Platonem*: of course this only applies to the *λογιστικόν* (see Esser, 88₁). — *uniformem*: *Phaedo* 80 B: *τῷ . . . μονοειδεῖ . . . ὁμοιότατον εἶναι ψυχῇ*. — *dumtaxat* here is not equivalent to *praesertim*, as is frequently the case in Tert. (see Kok, 150), but has its usual meaning, viz. 'at least'. — *Viderint*: see comm. on 2, 6. — *effigies*: this reading is rightly defended by Kroymann (*Quaest. Tert.*, 105), who refers to 6, 7 for *artes et disciplinae*, to ch. 9 for *effigies*, and concludes: "Dicit igitur quantum ad artes et disciplinas et quantum ad effigies animas esse posse multiformes, quantum ad substantiam omnes esse uniformes"; cf. also 20, 2: *ita et animam licebit semine uniformem, fetu multiformem*.

2. *venit ab anima . . . fiat a spiritu*: the variation of moods is due to the *clausula* (2 β γ). — *Nam et* is frequently put by Tert. instead of *iam et*; see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 87/90; Hoppe, *Tert.*, 13; Thierry, 128. For the dat. attached to *adesse*, see comm. on 9, 1. — *solummodo*, which is found from Plin. *n. h.* downwards, is especially frequent in juridical literature (see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 71/2, Kalb, *Roms Jur.*, 47). — *eo quod non habeant*, etc.: this was the view of Aristotle, e. g. *hist. anim.* 2, 15 (506a 1 seqq.): *ὅλως δὲ πάντα ὅσα τὸν ἀέρα δεχόμενα*

ἀναπνεῖ καὶ ἐκπνεῖ πάντ' ἔχει πνεύμονα καὶ ἀρτηρίαν καὶ στόμαχον; *ib.* 4, 9 (535b 5); *de part. anim.* 3, 6 (669a 3 *seqq.*); *de somn. et vigil.* 2 (456a 11/3); *de anim.* 1,5 (410b 31): εἴπερ μὴ πάντα ἀναπνέουσιν (sc. τὰ ζῶα); *de respir.* 9 (475a 29 *seqq.*), etc. Cf. also Galen *de usu part.* 6, 9 (III, 441. 444 Kühn); Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 2 (p. 76 Matth.): πολλὰ γὰρ ἐστὶ ζῶντα μὲν, ἀναπνέοντα δ' οὐ τὸν ἀέρα, ὥς τὰ ἔντομα πάντα . . . καὶ τὰ ἀναιμα καὶ τῶν θαλασσίων τὰ πολλὰ καὶ πάντα ὅσα οὐκ ἔχει πνεύμονα; from the literature περὶ θαυμασίων cf. Antigonus *Mirab.* 61 (67). — *organa spiritus*: similarly, in *ad nat.* 1, 8, 5 the tongue is called *ipsius animae organum*; cf. also *res.* 61 (122, 17): *organum dentium*, and *cor.* 5, 6/7: *propria membrorum . . . organa*. For further details, see comm. on *carm. de res. mort.* 160.

3. *examinatione*: in the sense of 'inquiry' this subst. is a law term (cf. e. g. *Ulp. dig.* 3, 5, 8, 2; 47, 14, 1, 4); connected with an objective genit. it is also found in *adv. Marc.* 1, 29 (333, 1); 3, 11 (393, 26); *apol.* 2, 3 (for this passage, see Waltz., *comm.*, 25); in *adv. Marc.* 2, 3 (336, 9) it is followed by *in* with an accus. — *eulicis . . . argumenta*: a genit. attached to *a.* is found from Pliny *n. h.* downwards, e. g. 5, 52: *iisdem animalium argumentis* (see Thes. 1. L. II: 545, 1/20); from Tert. cf. *iei.* 10 (287, 2). — For *respicere*, 'to take account of', see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 56/7; for *artifex deus*, see comm. on § 6. — *temperaverit*: for Tert.'s use of this verb, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 108. — *captanda* (B) is to be preferred to *aptanda* (A). Cf. Cic. *pro Rosc. Amer.* 35, 98: *etiamne in tam perspicuis rebus argumentatio quaerenda aut coniectura capienda sit?* (see Landgraf's note), and from Tert.'s works *res.* 40 (82, 26/7): *nilil autem mirum, si et ex ipsius instrumento captantur argumenta*; *adv. Herm.* 31 (159, 11/2): *sed et illud utique captabitur, de caelo solo et de terra ista scripturam significasse*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 12 (454, 5/6): *Marcion captat statum controversiae* (Kroym. *ad loc.*: 'captare = *sophistisch deuten*'); a somewhat different use is found *ib.* 3, 16 (402, 7/8): *si nomen Christi, ut sportulam furunculus, captavit* (sc. Marcion). Cf. also Rufin.-Orig. *de princ.* 3, 6, 4: *ex hoc ergo coniecturam capere possumus*. It is true that *aptare* is sometimes equivalent to *probare* (*adstruere*, κατασκευάζειν), e. g. Iren. *lat.* 1, 13, 2: *aptare volunt . . . et haec Dominum dixisse* (see Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 9), but Tert. never uses *aptare* in this way. In [Quint.] *declam.* 11, 3: *de mendacii magnitudine fidem veritatis aptavit* (sc. calumniator), too, the reading *captavit* given by the *traditio vulgata* is probably to be preferred. — *structus* is written instead of *instructus*, just as in *res.* 61 (123, 6/7): *quot steriles utriusque naturae infructuosis genitalibus structi?*; *apol.* 21, 14: *caro spiritu structa* (F; *instructa* V); *adv. Marc.* 4, 24 (500, 8); *v. v.* 9; *adv. Prax.* 8 (238, 11). On the other hand, in *pat.* 5 (7, 10/1): *de suo experimento quid ad peccandum adiutaret* <in>-*structus*, the conjecture by Ursinus should be adopted on account of the clausula. For the use of *struo* and its compounds, see Löfst., *Apol.*, 33; *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 78/9; *Verm. Stud.*, 126; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 138/9; Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 78; Svenberg, 110. Arnobius 3, 43 writes *structus* instead of *obstructus* to get a better clausula (see Hagendahl, *La prose métrique*

d' Arnobe, 164); it is for the same reason that in *pat.* 3 (5, 1) *structio* takes the place of *instructio*. For the influence of the clausula upon the substitution of simple verbs by their compounds and inversely, see Lindgren, 68/70, and the literature collected by Carlsson, 41; cf. also Axelsson, *Alex.*, 30₃.

4. **Herophilus**: in 25, 5 (where the killing of embryos is discussed) this physician is called *maiorum . . . prosector*. — *medicus aut lanus*: this refers to the fact that Herophilus, just as Erasistratus, vivisected condemned criminals; see Sieveking, art. 'Herophilos', R. E. VIII: 1105; Wellmann, art. 'Erasistratos 2)', *ib.* VI: 335/6 (cf. especially Galen *de uteri dissect.* 5 = II, 895 Kühn). Soranus was an adversary of anatomy and of surgery (cf. Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 2, 38, 219, where even bleeding is qualified as a *ingulatio*; laryngotomy, too, he looked upon as a crime: see Kind, R. E. II, 3: 1128); so the attack on Herophilus in this passage must have been suggested by him. To understand Tert.'s words rightly, we must consult the preface to Celsus' *De medicina*, from which we gain an insight into the controversies concerning this subject. According to this account, the so-called dogmatical physicians (p. 4, 35 *seqq.* Daremberg) emphasized the necessity of examining the interior organs *etiamnum spiritu remanente* for the purpose of healing; besides, they denied vivisection to be cruel: *neque esse crudele, sicut plerique proponunt, hominum nocentium, et horum quoque paucorum, suppliciis, remedia populis innocentibus saeculorum omnium quaeri*. In refutation of this view the empirical physicians (according to Wellmann, *loc. cit.*, the entire account derives from an adherent of this school, probably Heraclides of Tarent) argued that vivisection is both cruel and superfluous, as first many things still remain unknown, and secondly much knowledge is gained accidentally, for instance from wounds (the technical terms are ἡ κατὰ περίπτωσιν ἀνατομή καὶ τραυματικὴ θέα and ἡ κατ' ἐπιτήδευσιν ἀνατομή; see Deichgräber, *Empirikerschule*, 131, 23 and 132, 5). Moreover, it was pointed out that many parts of the body are altered by the very section (*interiora . . . sub gravissimis vulneribus et ipsa trucidatione mutari*, Cels. p. 7, 26/7 = 94, 5/6 Deichgr.; Tert.: *ipsa morte mutante quae vixerant*); for further particulars, see Wellmann, R. E. V: 2518; Deichgräber, 286. It is probable that the Sceptics, too, should have made use of this argument, for (apart from the close connection existing between the two schools) it occurs in Cic. *Acad.* 2, 39, 122 (130, 14/8 Deichgr.; according to Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skeptiz.*, 118, Cicero in this passage follows Philo of Larissa): *corpora nostra non novimus; qui sint situs partium, quam vim quaeque pars habeat, ignoramus. Itaque medici ipsi, quorum intererat ea nosse, aperuerunt ut viderentur. nec eo tamen aiunt empirici notiora esse illa quia possit fieri ut patefacta et detecta mutantur*. Tert., too, refers to vivisection, not to anatomy (though this was also rejected by Soranus), as is evident from the words *morte . . . ipsa inter artificia exsectionis errante*. It is unwarranted to follow Diels in writing *occidit* instead of *odiit*: Tert. clearly adopts the estimation of vivisection as a useless

cruelty and combats the view upheld by dogmatical physicians that it should be inspired by love towards mankind. Just as Tert. calls Herophilus a 'butcher', Celsus (p. 7, 35) qualifies a physician who carries out vivisection as a *latrocinans medicus*. Since similar descriptions are also found outside of strictly professional literature, we may suppose that this subject had become a topic of rhetoric. Cf. e. g. Quint. *declam.* 8, 19 (164, 11 *seqq.* Lehnert): *passus est miser discurrentem per omnia reserati pectoris improbum vagae artis errorem*. From a later period we may quote Ambrosiast. in Rom. 9, 17: *hoc etiam genere antiqui medici in hominibus morte dignis, vel mortis sententiam consecutis, requirebant quomodo prodessent vivis, quae in homine latebant, apertis; ut his cognoscerent causas aegritudinis, et poena morientis proficeret ad salutem viventis*. The influence of the passage under discussion is perhaps to be assumed in two places of Augustine's works, viz. *civ. dei.* 22, 24: *medicorum diligentia nonnulla crudelis quos anatomicos appellant laniavit corpora mortuorum sive etiam inter manus secantis* (T.: *inter artificia exsectionis perscrutantisque morientium, atque in carnibus humanis satis inhumane* (T.: *qui hominem odit*) *abditā cuncta rimata est, and de an. et ei. orig.* 4, 2, 3: *medici tamen qui appellantur anatomici per membra, per venas, per nervos, per ossa, per medullas, per interiora vitalia, etiam vivos homines quamdiu inter manus rimantium vivere potuerunt, dissiciendo scrutati sunt, ut naturam corporis nossent* (T.: *ut nosset*). Surgery is called by Prud. *perist.* 10, 498: *laniena . . . Hippocratica*; cf. also Fulgent. *Mitol. praef.* (9, 12/5 Helm): *bellis crudelior Galeni curia . . . quae pene cunctis Alexandriae ita est inserta angiportis, quo chirurgicae carnificinae laniola pluriora habitaculis numerentur*. — *odit* (A) is the correct reading (Oehler and Reifferscheid wrongly note that A has *odit*, which induced Löfstedt (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 101) to defend this reading on account of the *clausula*). *Odit* clearly has the sense of a perfect here; cf. *odies*, Lev. 19, 17 in *adv. Marc.* 4, 35 (539, 7; Vulg. *oderis*), *odientes*, *ib.* 4, 16 (468, 20), and *odituros*, *ad nat.* 1, 1, 4; *odis*, *c. Chr.* 4, 14 (T). For *odit* see also Rönsch, *It.*², 282 and Wohleb, 10₂. — *odit*, *ut nosset*: these words are a manifest thrust at the 'dogmatical' physicians, who defended vivisection by contending that it sprung from love of mankind. The combination of these two verbs is frequently found in Tert.'s apologetic writings, e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 20, 16: *cur, quod amatis et odistis, non noveritis?*; *apol.* 1, 5; *test. anim.* 3 (138, 8/9). — *nescio an*: 'probably not'; see comm. on 1, 2. — *et* is equivalent to *et . . . quidem*; see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 1/5 and *Patr.*, 1/2.

5. *Philosophi*: this primarily refers to Aristotle; cf. *hist. anim.* 4, 9 (535b 5); *respir.* 9 (475a 29 *seqq.*); Pliny *n. h.* 11, 266: *vocem non habere nisi quae pulmonem et arterias habeant, hoc est nisi quae spirent, Aristoteles putat. idcirco et insectis sonum esse, non vocem*. — *culicibus . . . tinea*: this enumeration is repeated in 32, 3. — *Atquin*, which is found sometimes in manuscripts of Plaut., Ter., and Cic., becomes more frequent after the first century after Christ (see Thes. l. L. II: 1085, 14/22); it is particularly common in juridical works and in Christian

literature. In the works contained in C. S. E. L. XX Tert. has *atqui* 6 times, *atqui* 38 times (in *de an.* always (9 ×) *atquin*, thrice before consonants); for *bapt.*, *paen.*, *ad nat.*, and *fuga*, see the *indices verborum* by Borleffs and Thierry. — *mandibulas*: Tp. — *aurium caeci*: 'blind to the ears', i. e. 'not able to reach the ears'. The explication is given by the next sentence, *tubam pariter et lanceam oris illius ostende*: gnats can buzz (*personare*), which proves that they possess mouths; our ears can bear witness to this, as they feel the stings (*lancea*) and hear the buzzing (*tuba*); however, nobody can see their mouths, which are 'both (*pariter*) lances and trumpets'. *caecus* governs an objective genitive, as in Lucan. 2, 14: *caeca futuri . . . fati*; Stat. *Theb.* 5, 718; Sil. Ital. 2, 206; Claudian. *carm.* 20, 429. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 9, 18: *caecus incesti sanguinis* (on the analogy of *ignarus*, see Waltz., *comm.*, 80). In the present passage the genit. is used on the analogy of expressions such as *impatiens frigoris*; see *comm.* on 26, 4: *seminis stupida* (= *seminis non sentiens*). The influence of the Greek is possible, but not very plausible, as τυφλός is seldom followed by an objective genit. (e. g. Xen. *conviv.* 4, 12: τυφλός δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων μᾶλλον δεξαίμην ἂν [εἶναι] ἢ Κλεινίου ἐνὸς ὄντος γενέσθαι). — *tubam . . . et lanceam*: the reading given by A (*hiantiam* B Gel) is supported by *adv. Marc.* 1, 14 (308, 12/3): *culicis et tubam et lanceam*; cf. Plin. *n. h.* 11, 3 (in a description of the gnat): *telum vero perfodiendo tergori quo spiculavit* (sc. *natura*) *ingenio*!; *Culex* 186. With *tubam pariter et lanceam* cf. Gregor. Magn. *moral.* 1, 21: *culex susurrando vulnerat*. Tert. was imitated by Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 91 (Anecd. Mareds., III, 2: 122): *habet* (sc. *culex*) *et tubam vocis*. — *unius licet puncti*: Hier. *loc. cit.*: *vide culicem, quomodo quasi punctum cuiusdam corpusculi est*; *adv. Rufin.* 3, 28: *formica parvum animal et punctum, ut ita dicam, corporis*; in *Ioel.* 2, 22 *seqq.* — *exhibe* (A; *exhibeas* B Gel) is certainly to be retained, as Tert. very frequently uses this imperative (e. g. *c. Chr.* 2, 16 and 4, 27; *pud.* 21 (269, 16); *adv. Marc.* 1, 11 (304, 21); 1, 21 (318, 6); 1, 23 (321, 19); 1, 24 (323, 1); 2, 23 (366, 23/4), etc.). — *decoquendi*: 'for digesting'; this meaning, which is found for the first time in Tert.'s works (*Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 204, 20/31), also occurs in *iei.* 6 (280, 8).

6. *Quid ergo dicemus?*: these words are used by Tert. to introduce a conclusion, e. g. *res.* 53 (112, 11). — *vivent*: it is not necessary to follow Borleffs (*Museum* 41 (1934), 312) in writing *vivunt* with Junius: the use of *vivent* is due to the preceding gnomic future, just as in *adv. Marc.* 5, 3 (577, 9/10): *eius ergo dei erit fides, in qua vivet iustus* (Junius once more writes *vivit*); in both cases the future in the subordinate clause also has gnomic force, or rather is synchronous to the future in the principal sentence. A third instance is found in *an.* 47, 2: *A deo . . . ea* (somnia) *deputabuntur, quae ipsi gratiae comparabuntur* ('which are granted <again and again> by the grace of God'). Cf. also 47, 4; Varro *l. l.* 9, 52: *quemadmodum inter se conferent ea quae quaternos habebunt vocabulis casus*, etc.; Hor. *ep.* 1, 16, 66: *qui metuens vivet, liber mihi non erit umquam* (see the note by Kiessling-

Heinze); Cic. *orat.* 56. 69. 122. A gnomic future in the subordinate clause without a preceding future is found in 32,3: *quaecumque de aemulo producentur elemento*; cf. also 37, 7: *qua duxerit eam* (sc. materiam), *qui aget (agit Pam.)*. — *mediocritate* = *parvitate*; this meaning, which is found from Vellei. 2, 111, 3 and 2, 130, 3 downwards, becomes frequent after Gell. — *credas, si*: see comm. on 9, 4. — *deum . . . artificem*: for the evolution of this conception, which is found from Aristotle downwards, see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Lehre von den Keimkräften*, 133. 148/9, and Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 190; many instances are also given in Thes. l. L. II: 700, 58 *seqq.* This doctrine was especially propagated by the Stoics, from whom it was borrowed by Christian apologists; it is extremely frequent in the works of Origen, Methodius, Basilus, and Augustine. From Tert. we may quote *apol.* 21, 10 (referring to the Stoics); *ad nat.* 2, 4, 19; *cult. fem.* 2, 5, 2; *adv. Prax.* 5 (234, 2); *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (308, 4/5); 3, 9 (390, 29); *res.* 5 (31, 25); 6 (33, 24); 60 (121, 25). — *modicis* = *parvis* (from Apul. downwards; see Médan, 159; Löfst., *Per.*, 71/2; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 414/6; Goelz., *Jér.*, 272; Rönsch, *It.*², 334/6; Linderbauer, 227). The expatiation is due to Tert.'s polemics against Marcion, who regarded the creation of insects as a proof for the pusillanimity of the Creator. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 14 (308, 6/14): *At cum et animalia inridet minutiora, quae maximus artifex de industria ingeniis aut viribus ampliavit, sic magnitudinem in mediocritate probari docens quemadmodum virtutem in infirmitate secundum apostolum, imitare, si potes, apis aedificia, formicae stabula, aranei retia, bombycis stamina, sustine, si potes, illas ipsas lectuli et tegulis tuae bestias, cantharidis venena, muscae spicula, culicis et tubam et lanceam. qualia erunt maiora, cum tam modicis aut iuvaris aut laederis, ut nec in modicis despicias creatorem?*; Hier. in *Isai.* 18, 1 *seqq.*: *Comparatione huius (sc. Epicuri) sceleratior Marcion, et omnes haeretici, qui vetus lacerant testamentum. Quum enim recipiant providentiam, accusant creatorem et asserunt eum in plerisque operibus errasse, et non ita fecisse, ut facere debuerat. Ad quam enim utilitatem hominum serpentes scorpios crocodilos et pulices cimicesque et culices pertinere?* For more passages, see Harnack, *Marcion*, 270* (we must add Hier. in *Ioel* 2, 22 *seqq.*). Moreover, Tert. was influenced by Pliny *n. h.* 11, 2 *seqq.*: *in magnis . . . corporibus aut certe maioribus facilis officina sequaci materia fuit. in his tam parvis atque tam nullis quae ratio, quanta vis, quam inextricabilis perfectio! ubi tot sensus collocavit (sc. natura) in culice? — et sunt alia dictu minora —, sed ubi visum in eo praetendit? ubi gustatum adplicavit? ubi odoratum inseruit? ubi vero trulentam illam et portione maximam vocem (T. tubam) ingeneravit? . . . (4) sed turrigeros elephantorum miramur numeros taurorumque colla et truces in sublime iactus, . . . cum rerum natura nusquam magis quam in minimis tota sit.* Hier. and Aug. very frequently give expression to this thought, e. g. Hier. *ep.* 60, 12, 1: *ut enim creatorem non in caelo tantum miramur et terra, . . . sed et in minutis quoque animalibus, formica, culice, muscis, vermiculis et istius modi genere, quorum magis corpora scimus quam nomina* (cf. *an.* 32, 3), *eandemque in cunctis veneramur sollertiam*; *tract. de Ps.* 91 (Anecd. Mareds., III, 2: 121, 17/8

and 122, 13 *seqq.*; id. *de Ps.* 103 (*ib.* 163, 4/5); id. *de Ps.* 110 (*ib.* 205, 16/8); Aug. *civ. dei* 11, 22 and 22, 24, 5; *de gen. ad litt.* 3, 14, 22; *de duab. anim.* 4, 4. See also Thom. Aquin., *Summa theol.* 1, qu. 47. The idea of emphasizing the usefulness of minute animals harks back to the Stoics; cf. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 1163 (Plut. *de Stoic. repugn.* 21 = 1044 D): 'Εν μὲν οὖν τῷ πέμπτῳ περὶ φύσεως, εἰπὼν (sc. ὁ Χρῡσιππος) ὅτι „οἱ κόρεις εὐχρήστως ἐξυπνίζουσιν ἡμᾶς, καὶ οἱ μύες ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἡμᾶς μὴ ἀμελῶς ἕκαστα τιθέναι". This view was contested by Carneades (Plut. *fragmenta incerta* 145, β.) and Philo of Larissa (Cic. *Acad.* 2, 38, 120). — **non putas** is equivalent to *putas non* (cf. Gr. οὐκ οἶμαι); see Sjögren, *Eran.* 11 (1911), 214; C. F. W. Müller, *Philol.* 9, 604 *seqq.*; Pettersson, *Liv.*, 147. Of course this sentence is directed against Marcion. — **capere**: cf. e. g. Min. Fel. 30, 1: *putas posse fieri, ut tam molle, tam parvulum corpus fata vulnere capiat?* — For **sic quoque**, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 28. — **sic . . . quod** is mostly found in texts of the last period of the Latin language; for Claudian. Mam., see Engelbrecht, *Sprache des Cl. M.*, 40/1, for instances from Sidon. Apollin., Goelz., *Jér.*, 382. — **animalibus . . . vivere instruxerit**: the same construction occurs in 35, 1: *Sed non tibi soli metempsychosis hanc fabulam instruxit*. Other instances are found in Plaut. *mil. glor.* 981, 1100 and Catull. 21, 7: *insidias mihi instruentem* (instead of *struentem*; see Kroll's note). — **esu**: of this subst. the abl. without preposition is found for the first time in Tert., just as the nomin. (*iei.* 9 = 285, 29). — **denticulis** is written instead of *dentibus* for the sake of rhyme (the word is found from Vitruv. 9, 8, 5 downwards). For the same reason Tert. has put *digestu* instead of *digestione* (*digestus* is found in two more places only, once (*carm. de Iona* 103) in the sense of 'digestion', and once (*Stat. silv.* 3, 3, 87) as an equivalent of *dispensatio*). — **alveis** is used here instead of *alvis*. For more instances, see Thes. l. L. I: 1791, 69/81 (from Tert. *res.* 60 (120, 27) and *apol.* 9, 11); cf. also Linde, 14. We may add Arnob. 2, 16: *ex alveis fundimur atque emittimur matrum* (*alvis* Sabaeus; Löfst., *Arnob.*, 66, defends *alveis* by referring to the clausula); Amm. Marc. 22, 15, 18 (see Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 151). *alvus* instead of *alveus* is found in the sermon for Whitsuntide edited by Caspari, *Briefe, Abh. u. Pred.* (ch. 4, p. 199): *limitem alvi fluvialis*. In Verg. *georg.* 2, 453: *vitiosaeque ilicis alvo*, the reading is not certain (most editors follow R, which gives *alveo*; see the note by Servius). — **manante impetu**: cf. *carm. de Sodoma* 48: *quae per terram protracto corpore manant*. — **quod angues**: undoubtedly we must follow Hoppe (*Synt.*, 145) in assuming an ellipsis of *facere*, just as in *apol.* 21, 30: *non qua rupices . . . ad humanitatem temperaret, quod Numa*; *pub.* 21 (269, 10/11); *idol.* 5 (35, 7); *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 21); cf. e. g. Cic. *Mil.* 10, 28: *obviam fit ei Clodius . . . nullis Graecis comitibus, ut solebat, sine uxore, quod nunquam fere*. An ellipsis of *esse* after *quod* is more usual, e. g. *pall.* 5, 3: *at enim pallio nihil expeditius, etiam si duplex, quod Cratetis*; *apol.* 8, 5: *homo es et ipse, quod et Christianus*; . . . *homo . . . Christianus, quod et tu*; *adv. Marc.* 5, 10 (607, 27); *an.* 19, 2. In the following passages, where it is less easy to supply the missing words, *quod* begins to develop

into an equivalent of *ut*: *adv. Herm.* 44 (173, 22 *seqq.*): *nam etsi apparuit deus materiae, sed non vulneravit illam, quod decor* (Kroym. *acor*) *animum, etsi adpropinquavit, sed non cohaesit illi, quod magnes ferro; adv. Val.* 30 (206, 4/5): *et utique abortui deputamur, quod mater illorum; exh. cast.* 4, 39/42: *Proprie enim apostoli spiritum sanctum habent, qui plene habent . . . non quasi ex parte, quod ceteri.* Undoubtedly this use of the relative pronoun in elliptical sentences has facilitated the use of the conjunction *quod* as an equivalent of *ut* ('just as') in a later period (cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 723; Goelz., *Jér.*, 381/2; Löfst., *Beitr.*, 18 *seqq.*; Spätl., *Stud.*, 9 *seqq.*; Verm. *Stud.*, 14/8; Grevander, 37/8; W. A. Baehrens, *Glotta* 5 (1914), 88/9; Lundström, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 7; Väänänen, 213/4; Hedfors, 174). In several of the instances quoted it seems preferable to consider *quod* as a relative pronoun, e. g. Hygin. *de munit. castr.* 49 (35, 13/4 Gemoll): *contrarium devexum fit, quod (quomodo Schellius and Gemoll) in fastigata* ('which happens' = 'just as happens'); similarly, in Gell. 13, 2, 5: *nam quod in pomis, itidem . . . esse aiunt in ingeniis*, we should rather assume an elliptical relative clause than a contamination of *ut . . . itidem* and *quod . . . id (idem)*, as is done by Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 16. For the opposite case (*ut* instead of a relative pronoun), see Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 7/11 and Tidn., *Did.*, 202. — *conatu*: cf. Arnob. 7, 44: (Aesculapius forma serpentis sumpta) *ut pergere prorsus possit, partem sui postremam conatibus prioris adducit* (for the numerous conjectures made on this passage, see Kistner, 45/6). For *insurgente*, cf. e. g. Apul. *met.* 11, 3: *sulcis insurgentium viperarum*, for *spumante reptatu*, *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 1: *concharum salivis*.

7. *non putes* again (cf. § 6) is written instead of *putes non*: "why should you consider breathing to be impossible without lungs and windpipes?" — *pulmonum follibus*: a much-used image, e. g. schol. Pers. 1, 13: *flatus ex pulmone accipitur et emittitur in modum folliis*; Aug. c. *Iulian.* 4, 14, 68; Vindician. 22 (Thes. l. L. VI: 1016, 55 *seqq.*). It is found already in Arist. *de respir.* 7 (474a 12/3): ἀπαντες μὲν γὰρ τὸν τόπον, καθάπερ τὰς φύσας ἐν τοῖς χαλκείοις, ἀναπνεύουσιν; ib. 21 (480a 21). Cf. also Iuven. 7, 111: *inmensa cavi spirant mendacia folles*; Vindician. in Theodor. Prisc. 438 and 472 Rose; Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 3, 4, 4: *pulmones . . . anima . . . sicut folles movet*; Fulgent. *Mitol.* 1, 15 (25, 13/4 Helm); Herm. in Stob. *ecl.* I: 467, 21 *seqq.* Wachsm. — *fistulis artiarum*: this expression may have been borrowed from Pliny *n. h.* 11, 175: *duabus . . . fistulis. interior earum appellatur arteria, ad pulmonem atque cor pertinens*; cf. Gell. 17, 11, 3; Lactant. *opif. dei* 11, 5; Thes. l. L. II: 686, 15/48. — *amplectaris*: similarly, 19, 3: *amplectemur exemplum*; *exh. cast.* 3, 47/8; *ad ux.* 1, 7; cf. Thes. l. L. I: 1991, 9 *seqq.* — *accedere* is almost equivalent to *accidens esse*; see comm. on 6, 5. — *flaturalibus*: ἄ. λ. For *artibus* used instead of *artubus*, see Thes. l. L. II: 711, 57/71. *Structi* once more takes the place of *instructi* (see comm. on § 3); here again this is due to the clausula (cl. 3 in its complete form). The construction of this sentence, which forms the conclusion of the first part of Tert.'s argument, is not strictly logical, as the *magnum argumentum* of course lies in the fact that

certain animals lack respiratory organs; this argument loses its value by the assertion that breathing is possible without respiratory organs (see the preface to this chapter, p. 181). So we must assume a confusion of two sentences, viz. *ut dicas idcirco animae . . . structa non sint* and *ut pro magn. ampl. arg. animalia esse quae de flaturalibus artibus structa non sint* <ut inde probes, esse quae spiritu careant et inde iam, animae humanae spiritum accedere>. In the next sentence (*Vivere . . . non putas?*) this thought, which for Tert. crowns the refutation, is adroitly opposed to the chief argument of his adversaries. The rest of the paragraph contains a new argument, which may be summed up in the following way: A. 1. *spirare est agere flatum*. 2. (*mortui est non agere flatum, ergo*) *viventis est agere flatum*. 3. (*sed spirantis est agere flatum,*) *ergo spirare viventis est*. After this Tert. adds that if *utrumque* (i. e. *et vivere et spirare*) 'could take place without the soul' (which is a fairly complicated way of saying 'if these two notions were not both connected with the soul'), it might indeed be possible for the soul to live only, and not to breathe as well. Next the conclusion of the first syllogism is repeated in an altered form, which leads to a second syllogism: B. 1. *vivere spirare est et spirare vivere est*. 2. *anima vivit*. 3. *ergo anima et vivit et spirat* <*unde anima et spiritus una eademque substantia sunt*>. The repetition of the major premiss of the first syllogism before the conclusion (in a form adapted to the minor premiss: *viventis est agere flatum* > *spirantis est agere flatum*) recalls a very common habit of Tert. (cf. the index s. v. 'syllogisms'). The rather complicated structure of this syllogism is primarily due to the fact that in I B Tert. did not dare to write *vivere est flatum agere* (in which case he might have concluded: *spirare vivere est, ergo anima, quae vivit, eo ipso etiam spirat*); as his starting-point he takes the assertion *mortui est non agere flatum*, from which he concludes *viventis est agere flatum*; nevertheless, in II B he writes *vivere spirare est et spirare vivere est*, without having any right to do so. — *decurrere* 'take place'; this sense (which is found from Sen. downwards; cf. *Thes. l. Lat. V*, 1: 231, 49/74) also occurs in 16, 5; *adv. Prax.* 16 (258, 13); *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 4; *adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (423, 13); *ad nat.* 2, 5, 8. — *solummodo*: see comm. on § 2. — *totum hoc et spirare et vivere*: the words *et spirare et vivere* have the function of a subst. (cf. *Utrumque si sine anima decurrere potuisset*). Pronouns are found attached to such infinitives from Cic. downwards, cf. *fin.* 1, 1, 1: *totum hoc . . . philosophari*; Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 274; E. Wölfflin, *A. L. L.* 3, 85. 90; for Tert., see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 18/9 and *Synt.*, 42; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 59. *Totum hoc* (which is often used for the purpose of introducing a scholion: Stangl, *Pseudoascon.*, 96) is frequently found in Tert.'s works, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 1, 10 (303, 22); 1, 11 (304, 24; 305, 1); 5, 3 (578, 24); *res.* 49 (102, 11); *adv. Val.* 26 (203, 5). — *euius et vivere*: the minor premiss is repeated in the conclusion, as is frequently done by Tert.; cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 73 seqq.

8. The argument advanced in this paragraph is also used in the discussion of the relation between *anima* and *animus* (18, 9; cf. 18, 7). —

si separas spiritum: "if you separate the life-breath <from the soul>", almost: "if you represent the life-breath as an isolated (a special) substance"; see the notes on 11, 2, *spiritus distinctionem*, and 16, 2, *delicti diversitas*. — **opera** is almost equivalent to *opus* or rather to the plural *opera* (see Kroym., *Quaest. Tert.*, 105); cf. § 9: *distinguunt substantias opera*. The same meaning is found in 11, 1 and 14, 4, where the fem. *opera* is opposed to *substantia* (however, in *adv. Marc.* 5, 14 (623, 16/7) Tert. writes: *non substantiam damnans, sed opera eius*). For further details from Tert.'s works, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 76 and Waltz., *Ét.*, 356; for the later period in general, cf. Rönisch, *It.*², 317/8 and *Sem.*, 1, 51; Tidn., *Did.*, 237 and 253; Thielm., A. L. L. 8, 545; Blomgren, *Eran.* 34 (1936), 28₁; Engelbrecht, *Ztschr. f. d. österr. Gymn.* 41 (1890), 483; Hartel, A. L. L. 3, 27; A. Erikson, 7/8; Koffmane, 93; Bonnet, 352. — **in discreto** = *discrete*; this expression seems to occur in this passage only (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1307, 1/2). For more instances of the use of *in* followed by the ablat. of an adjunct. as an adv., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 100; Löfst., *Apol.*, 84 and 99/100; Waltz., *Ét.*, 189/90 and 264; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 100. — **divisione eorum alterius discedentis alterius inmanentis**: cf. comm. on 26, 4: *ut altera seminis stupida, altera intacta. Inmanere* occurs for the first time in the *Itala*. — **si fuissent**: 'if they had been <two>'; cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 9 (603, 23/4): *nec sacerdos autem Ezechias nec in aevum, etsi fuisset* (sc. *sacerdos*). Tert. frequently puts *si fuisset* at the end of a long sentence (however, mostly in the sense of: "if it had existed"), e. g. *adv. Marc.* 3, 2 (378, 12); 4, 8 (438, 16); 4, 20 (485, 21); 5, 3 (576, 23). For the variation of tenses (*possent . . . fuissent*), see Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 97/8; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 70; Gerlo, 2, 144/5.

9. In the last paragraph Tert. rejects the possibility of soul and life-breath being two different substances which, however, have grown together. The refutation by Tert. may be paraphrased in the following way: "Substances with different functions must remain separate <, and so cannot grow together> (*distinguunt substantias opera*). If living is different from breathing, soul and life-breath <have different functions, and so> cannot grow together." After this Tert. continues: "However, if (as was proved in § 7) whatever lives, also breathes, we are obliged to conclude that soul and life-breath are one substance". The subsequent exposition was suggested by the fact that the soul is not completely identical with the *spiritus*, as the word *spiritus* has more significations than 'life-breath', one of which will be discussed in the next chapter. Hence Tert. points out that it is only in the sense of 'life-breath' that *spiritus* is identical with *anima*, just as *lux* is only identical with *dies*, when it means 'day-light' (this example is a very common one in philosophical literature, cf. for instance *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 214 *seqq.*; since it is particularly frequent in the works of Sextus Empiricus, we may perhaps suppose that Tert. should have become acquainted with it through the intermediary of Soranus, cf. Introduction, p. 30*). — **licet et**: see for this combination, which is very frequent in Tert.'s works, Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 55₂. — **Sed . . . sed**: similarly, e. g. *adv. Iud.* 3, 1/2:

'*Sed Abraham*', inquires, '*circumciscus est*'. *Sed ante deo placuit, quam circumcideretur* (. *Est, sed* Kroym.). — *firmius est*, i. e. *verius est*, is a law term (Thes. l. L. VI: 818, 69 *seqq.*). — *das* = *concedis*, cf. Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1678, 56 *seqq.* — *ipsius . . . cuius*: in Tert.'s works *ipse* is frequently almost equivalent to *idem*, but in most cases its original meaning still obtains, especially before a relative clause ('the very same'). According to Hoppe (*Synt.*, 104), *ipse* in such cases is identical with *idem*; however, such a passage as 35, 6: *idem et ipse*, which he believes to support this interpretation, rather shows that Tert. felt a difference between the two words. The meaning 'the very same' is especially obvious in passages dealing with metempsychosis or resurrection, e. g. *apol.* 48, 2: *Iam non ipsae* ('exactly the same souls') *sunt, quae fuerant*; *de an.* 32, 8. 9; 33, 1. The change of the signification seems to have started from *ipse qui* (from Vellei. 2, 125, 4 and Val. Max. 4, 5, 6 downwards), though *ipse* in the sense of *idem* already occurs is a law from 9 b. Chr. mentioned by Frontin. *aq.* 129 (the next instances occur not until Suet.). For further particulars, cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 479/80; Kalb, *Roms Jur.*, 140; Goelz., *Jér.*, 406; Bonnet, 301; Rönsch, *It.*², 424 and *Sem.*, 2, 26/7; Elg, 22; Svenn., *Pallad.* 307/8. — *et vivere*: for the pleonasm, see comm. on 1, 6. — *diem . . . lucem*: see the comm. on the beginning of this paragraph; cf. also *scorp.* 9 (164, 23): *si diem dixeris, lucis rem ostendisti, quae diem praestat*; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 106: *itaque lucis ministerium . . . dies nuncupatur*. — *ut ex ignium ministerio*, i. e. *ut genus lucis e. i. m. oriens*; likewise, *ut ex deo*, *ut ex diabolo*, sc. *orta spiritus species*. In cases like these the Latin language is clearly in want of an article. For more instances from Tert., see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 57/61; cf. also Kroll's note on Cic. *orat.* 1, 4; Persson, *Tac.*, 105; Kiessling-Heinze's note on Hor. *carm.* 4, 1, 4 *seqq.*; Lebreton, *Ét. Cic.*, 90; Plasberg, *Rh. Mus.* 53 (1898), 79 *seqq.* For substantives originating in this way, see Svenn., *Oribas.*, 112/4 (e. g. *pubetenus* 'abdomen', *supercunnum* = ἐφῆβον); Bendz, *Cael.*, 32; Mörland, 186; Väänänen, 181. — *Ipsum est enim quid, per quod est quid*: an impressive thesis invented for the occasion, just as 18, 13: *per quod enim quid est, cum ipso est*, or 53, 4: *totius ultimum totum est, quia . . . ipsius est*. A similar statement is made in c. Chr. 9, 3/5: *omnis materia sine testimonio originis suae non est, etsi demutetur in novam proprietatem*.

11. *The difference between anima and spiritus.*

"When in the preceding chapter I called the soul *spiritus*, I did so, because the function of breathing is often wrongly ascribed to a substance other than the soul; I only wanted to say that it is the soul which breathes, and that hence it may be called *spiritus* with regard to its function, but not to its substance (§ 1). In my confutation of Hermogenes, who regards the soul as proceeding from matter, and not from the breath of God, I have explicitly set forth the difference of *anima* and *spiritus* (§ 2). I would not dwell any longer upon this subject but for the fact that some heretics 'inoculate' a certain germ

of the *spiritus* into the soul <, and so represent the *spiritus* as part of the substance of the soul>, without paying attention to such scriptural texts as give a clear idea of the functional meaning of *spiritus* (§ 3). <It is true that Holy Scripture also mentions a substantial *spiritus* bestowed on man, but this is an *accidens*:> when Adam prophesied through the *spiritus*, he underwent an *accidentia spiritus*, which was the natural consequence of his ecstasy (§ 4); similarly, the evil spirit which took possession of Saul and Judas, was an *accidens* (§ 5). So we may draw the conclusion that the soul is a simple and uniform substance indeed, and consequently, that the function of breathing is not inserted into it as a separate substance, but flows from its intrinsic nature (§ 6)''.

After an introductory remark with regard to the identification of *anima* and *spiritus* in chapter 10, Tert. proceeds to a discussion of the two meanings of *spiritus* and shows that there is always a difference to be stated between the latter and the soul. § 2 has been repeated from *De censu animae*, and the discussion of Adam's prophesy is to be understood in the light of Tert.'s adherence to Montanism. More important is the confutation of the Valentinians in § 3, which leads to an exposition of the difference between the *flatus dei* and the *spiritus dei*. The definition of the soul as *flatus dei* (or rather as *flatus ex spiritu dei factus*) had been discussed in detail in *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 and in *De censu animae* (see the Introduction, pp. 10*/1*). In this paragraph the influence of Iren. 5, 12, 2 is indubitable, as Irenaeus applies the same scriptural texts (Jes. 42, 5 and 57, 16) to set forth the difference between *afflatus* (πνοή) and *spiritus* (πνεῦμα; see H. Koch, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 104 (1932), 136₂); on account of the numerous points of agreement with Tert.'s way of reasoning it seems useful to quote the entire passage (the Greek text has been preserved by an old commentary on Genesis, see Harvey, 2, 350/2): "Ἐτερόν ἐστι πνοή ζωῆς, ἡ καὶ ψυχικὸν ἀπεργαζομένη τὸν ἄνθρωπον · καὶ ἕτερον πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν, τὸ καὶ πνευματικὸν αὐτὸν ἀποτελοῦν. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Ἡσαΐας φησὶν · οὕτω λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ στερεώσας αὐτὸν, ὁ πῆξας τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ · καὶ διδούς πνοὴν τῷ λαῷ τῷ ἐπ' αὐτῆς, καὶ πνεῦμα τοῖς πατοῦσιν αὐτῇν (42, 5) · Τὴν μὲν πνοὴν παντὶ κοινῶς τῷ ἐπὶ γῆς λαῷ φήσας δεδόσθαι, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἰδίως καταπατοῦσι τὰς γεώδεις ἐπιθυμίας. Διὸ καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἡσαΐας διαστέλλων τὰ προειρημένα φησί· Πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐποίησα (57,16). Τὸ πνεῦμα ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξας τοῦ ἐκχέοντος αὐτὸ ... διὰ τῆς υἰοθεσίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα (Latin translation: *quem in novissimis temporibus effudit per adoptionem filiorum in genus humanum*) · τὴν δὲ πνοὴν κοινῶς ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, καὶ ποίημα ἀναγορεύσας αὐτήν. Ἐτερον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ποιηθὲν τοῦ ποιήσαντος. Ἡ οὖν πνοὴ πρόσκαιρος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀένναον · καὶ ἡ μὲν πνοὴ ἀκμάσασα πρὸς βραχὺ, καὶ καιρῷ τινι παραμείνας, μετὰ τοῦτο πορεύεται, ἄπνουν καταλιποῦσα ἐκεῖνο, περὶ δὲ τὴν τὸ πρότερον · τὸ δὲ περιλαβὼν ἔνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον

(sc. τὸ πνεῦμα), ὅτε αἰὲ παραμόνιμον, οὐδέποτε καταλείπει αὐτόν (here the Greek fragment ends). *Sed non primo quod spiritale est, ait Apostolus, hoc tanquam ad nos homines dicens, sed primo quod animale est, deinde quod spiritale* (1 Cor. 15, 46) *secundum rationem. Opportuerat enim primo plasari hominem, et plasmatum accipere animam; deinde sic communionem Spiritus recipere. Quapropter et primus Adam factus est a Domino in animam viventem, secundus Adam in spiritum vivificantem* (1 Cor. 15, 45). (Here begins another Greek fragment, preserved by Ioann. Damasc.) Ὡς οὖν ὁ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν γεγονώς, ῥίψας ἐπὶ τὸ χειρὸν, ἀπώλεσε τὴν ζωὴν· οὕτως πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἐπανελθὼν, καὶ προσλαβόμενος τὸ ζωοποιῶν πνεῦμα, εὐρήσει τὴν ζωὴν. For the interpretation of Jes. 42, 5 and 57, 16 by Iren. and Tert., see d'Alès, *Théol. de Tert.*, 248/9.

The distinction made by Tatian. (*Orat. ad Graec.* 12) between ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα is totally different: according to him the soul is a πνεῦμα ὑλικόν, whereas the πνεῦμα is a higher essence, μεῖζον . . . τῆς ψυχῆς, Θεοῦ δὲ εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις. For 1 Thess. 5, 23, see von Dobschütz's note and Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh* (Amer. Journ. of Theol. 18 (1914), 395 seqq.; 571 seqq.; 20 (1916), 390 seqq.; 563 seqq.). With regard to the sense of *spiritus* in § 1 we may refer to [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, append. 42, 3 (p. 425 Souter): *spiritus enim frequenter pro anima ponitur dicente evangelio inter cetera: 'et reversus est', inquit, 'spiritus eius ad illam'* (Luc. 8, 55); then the author demonstrates that in Gen. 2, 7 *spiritus vitae* does not mean *spiritus sanctus*, but *spiritus vitae . . . quia animat corpora ad vitam*; similarly, Ambrst. in 1 Cor. 2, 11 (who also quotes Luc. 8, 55), Hier. *Didym. de spir. s.* 54, and Aug. *de trin.* 14, 16, 22.

1. *Hoc . . . vindicamus*: cf. 1, 3. — *quam . . . agnoscimus*: cf. 10, 1: *Pertinet ad statum fidei simplicem animam determinare . . . id est uniformem, dumtaxat substantiae nomine*. For *nomine*, see the use in 6, 2. — *status . . . actus*: cf. 27, 5 *instinctu . . . actu*; 45, 2 *actu . . . effectui*; 53, 3 *actu . . . statu*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 7 (299, 4): *nomini . . . status*. — *substantia . . . opera*: similarly, 14, 4: *spiritus* (in organo hydraulico) . . . *substantia quidem solidus, opera vero divisus*; for *opera* = *opus* or *operatio*, see the note on 10, 8. The sentence refers to 10, 9: *ut ipsa sit anima spiritus, dum ipsius est spirare cuius et vivere*. — *defendimus*: in the sense of 'comprobare, ostendere, evincere, affirmare' (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 298, 7) this verb is found from Cic. *ep. ad Quint. frat.* 1, 3, 2 downwards. It often occurs in Tert.'s writings; with two accus., just as here, § 2; 21, 3; *adv. Marc.* 5, 11 (611, 20) (*pass. ib.* 4, 15 = 465, 4); with an *accus. c. inf.*: *adv. Herm.* 9 (136, 4); *adv. Marc.* 1, 6 (297, 17). — *ex necessitate*: Lindner explains: "affinitate, quia flatus = spiritus"; the occurring of the terms *compellit* in § 1 and *ingratis* in § 2 sufficiently refutes this interpretation.

2. *adversus ipsius scripturae fidem*: in Gen. 2, 7 Hermogenes read πνεῦμα instead of πνοήν. He considered the bestowing of this πνεῦμα

upon Adam by God as having no relation to the natural constitution of man, but as an accidental addition ("eine accidentelle Mitteilung des *spiritus* . . ., welcher zu dem aus der Materie gebildeten Menschen hinzukam", Esser, 33₂). — *dum* . . . *devenire*: for this reason it was impossible to Hermogenes to regard this πνεῦμα as a *naturale animae*, still less, to consider it as the essence of the soul. — *in delictum* . . . *devenire*: similarly, *praescr.* 12, 14: *in quaestionem devenire* (cf. *an.* 4: *quaestionem* . . . *patitur*); *adv. Marc.* 4, 10 (447, 10/1): (causa) *per quam deveniat in communionem*; *adv. Herm.* 2 (127, 16): (deum) *in partes non devenire* (= indivisibilem esse). For the development of the meaning of *devenire* into Fr. 'devenir', see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 850, 77 seq.; Sverr., *Pallad.*, 460₁; 648; Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 28/9. — *spiritus distinctionem*: in Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1519, 80/4 this passage is wrongly combined with *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (599, 18 = 1 Cor. 12, 10): *distinctio spirituum* (διακρίσεις, Vulg. *discretio*), where the idea is totally different, and with *pub.* 19 (265, 13): *distinctione delictorum*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 14 (354, 7/8): *adhibita distinctione utriusque formae*. It is far more probable that we should adopt Esser's paraphrase (p. 93): "wegen der verschiedenen Bedeutung, welche dieser Terminus nun einmal hat", and translate: "because of the spirit's being completely different <from the *flatus*>" (cf. the contrast to *communionem*); parallels may be found in 16, 2, *delicti diversitas* "the separateness of sin", and 10, 8, *si separas spiritum* "if you separate the spirit <from all other things>"; cf. also *adv. Herm.* 30 (158, 25/7): *negavit confusionem substantiarum, quarum . . . demonstravit etiam distinctionem* ("their being separated from each other"). — *secundum spirandi et flandi communionem*: just as in § 1 (*Nam et flare spirare est*) Tert. argues that the soul *quae flat, inde etiam spirat* (cf. 10, 7: *quid est . . . spirare? flatum, opinor, ex semetipso agere*). Of course this argument is based upon the definition of the soul as *flatus*; we may give the following paraphrase: "*anima est flatus, ergo flat; sed flare spirare est* (10, 7), *ergo anima spirat* (cf. § 6: *non aliunde spirantem quam ex substantiae suae sorte*), *unde spiritus vocari potest*. Arguing in this way Tert. overlooks the fact that the soul only may be called *flatus* in so far as it has proceeded from the breath of God (see Introduction, pp. 10*/1*), which fact affords no proof for its breathing.

3. *Nec diutius de isto*: this expression, which also occurs in *adv. Prax.* 7 (236, 12) and *praescr.* 6, 1 (similarly, *spect.* 4 (6, 7/8); *pat.* 4 (5, 25); *ad nat.* 1, 12, 12; 2, 13, 9), is typical of Tert.'s impatience; we may also refer to 46, 1: *Et quando pervenimus ad mortem?* (≈ 50, 1); 35, 4: *Ceterum ad Carpocraten* (44, 1: *Ceterum de Hermotimo*). — *haereticos*: viz. the Valentinians, cf. 23, 4: *examen Valentini semen Sophiae infulcit animae*; *adv. Val.* 25 (201, 16 seqq.; borrowed from Iren. 1, 1, 10): *inerat autem in Achamoth ex substantia Sophiae matris peculium quoddam seminis spiritalis, sicut et ipsa Achamoth in filio Demiurgo sequestraverat, ne hoc quidem gnaro. accipe industriam clandestinae providentiae huius. ad hoc enim et deposuerat et occultaverat, ut, cum Demiurgus animam mox de suo adflatu in Adam communicaret, pariter*

et semen illud spiritale quasi per canalem animam derivaretur in choicum, atque ita, feturatum in corpore materiali velut in utero et adultum illic, idoneum inveniretur suscipiendo quandoque sermoni perfecto; exc. ex Theodoto 48 and 53, 2. — infuleiunt is found in 23, 4 in the same context; cf. also *adv. Val.* 27 (203, 7/10): *nunc reddo de Christo, in quem tanta licentia Iesum inserunt quidam, quanta spiritale semen animali cum inflatu infulciunt, fertilia nescio quae commenti et hominum et deorum.* Though this word is never used as an agricultural term, we still may reckon with the possibility that its occurrence in this context is due to the use of ἐγκεντρίζειν in Rom. 11, 17/24 (see Wetstein's note; cf. also Synes. *de insomn.* 138 C: φύσιν δὲ ἔχει (sc. τὸ σῶμα) τὴν ἀπαξ ἐγκεκεντρισμένην εἰς αὐτὸ ψυχὴν; Procl. 359, 26 B: διὰ τὴν σωματικὴν εἰς ἣν ἐνεκεντρίσθητε φύσιν; Damasc., *Dubit. et solut.* I: 162, 15 Ruelle; W. Kroll, *De oracul. Chald.*, 56₂; H. Koch, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 104 (1932), 136). — *factore*, viz. the *demiurgus*. — *promulgaverit*: a law term, for which see the note on 46, 6. — *instrumentis*: 'books forming part of Holy Scripture' (here: "in Isai."), not 'scriptural passages'. Tert. often uses this word in the sense of *scriptura sacra* (e. g. *res.* 39 (82, 22): *per totum paene instrumentum*) or *testamentum* (*adv. Herm.* 20 (149, 2): *instrumenti veteris*), or to denote a certain part of the Bible, e. g. *res.* 33 (72, 1): *de prophetico instrumento*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 2 (426, 6/7): *evangelicum instrumentum*; see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 51, and Bindley's note on *praescr.* 38 (p. 86). — *spiritus . . . feci*: Isai. 57, 16: πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐποίησα (Vulg.: *quia spiritus a facie mea egredietur; et flatus ego faciam*; *adv. Herm.* 32 (161, 20/1): *quia spiritus a me exivit et flatum omnem ego feci*); *feci* is also found in quotations of this verse in Iren. lat. 5, 12, 2; Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 1, 14, 21; *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 6, 9; Fulgent. Rusp. *contra Fabian.*, frag. 15. — *Et anima enim flatus factus ex spiritu*: for this definition, see the Introduction, pp. 10*/1*. — *et rursus*: for the various formulas used by Tert. to introduce quotations from Holy Scripture, see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 85₄ and 86₁. — *carналiter*: a Christianity, which occurs for the first time in the *Itala* (Thes. l. L. III: 476, 19 *sqq.*). — *quod spiritale*: the text of 1 Cor. 15, 46 (ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν) shows that it is wrong to insert *est* with B and Gelenius; similarly, *adv. Marc.* 5, 10 (607, 10): *non primum quod spiritale* and *res.* 53 (111, 12/3 and 112, 5/6).

4. The description of Adam's ecstasy, which transitorily changed him into a *spiritalis homo* (whereas according to the Valentinians the πνευματικὸν σπέρμα constituted an element of his essential being; see the passages quoted in the note on § 3, *haereticos*), can only be understood in the light of Tert.'s Montanism (see the preface to ch. 45). Cf. 21, 2: *Quid enim spiritale in illo* (sc. Adam)? *Si quia prophetavit magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam . . . hoc postea obvenit, cum in illum deus amentiam inmisit, spiritalem vim, qua constat prophetia*, and *iei.* 3 (277, 5/10), where a connection is assumed between abstinence from food and the occurrence of ecstasy:

acceperat Adam a deo legem non gustandi de arbore agnitionis boni et mali, moriturus si gustasset. verum et ipse tunc in psychicum reversus post ecstasin spiritalem, in qua magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam prophetaverat, nec iam capiens quae erant spiritus, facilius ventri quam deo cessit. For *prophetare* (the verb is found for the first time in the *Itala*), see Mohrmann, *Aug.*, 139/40. — *magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam*: Ephes. 5, 32: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο (viz. Gen. 2, 23/4, which has just been quoted) μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. For the interpretation of this passage, see Car. Barth, 92, and especially Dibelius' note (*Hdb. N. T.* 12, p. 73): "Der Inhalt des „Geheimnisses" ist das Verhältnis Christi zur Gemeinde; fraglich scheint zunächst, ob man bei μυστήριον an die Ehe oder an die Schriftstelle denken soll. Für das letztere spricht die Beobachtung, dass unsere Stelle ja nicht die Institution der Ehe auf den ἐρὸς γάμος zwischen Christus und der ἐκκλησία deutet, sondern umgekehrt Regeln für die Ehegatten vom ἐρὸς γάμος herleitet". In any case it is certain that for Tert. *sacramentum* here denotes the scriptural passage, "which refers to (in with accus.) Christ and the Church". Cf. *adv. Marc.* 3, 5 (383, 3/5): (apostolus) *suggerens Ephesiis, quod in primordio de homine praedicatum est* (= *magnum illud sacramentum*), *relicturo patrem et matrem et futuris duobus in unam carnem, id se in Christum et ecclesiam agnoscere*. According to Tert.'s conception of ecstasy, Adam did not himself understand the words he spoke; it was St. Paul who revealed their true sense (cf. *exh. cast.* 5, 16 *seqq.*; *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 = 641, 6/7; for Marcion's interpretation, see Harnack, *Marcion*, 120*). The quotations of Gen. 2, 23/4 in Tert. show very divergent forms: *v. v.* 5 (*propterea; conglutinetur; in una carne*); *an.* 21, 2 (*vocabitur mulier; propterea; agglutinetur; in carnem unam*); *res.* 7 (34, 22/3); *mon.* 4, 9; *exh. cast.* 5, 11. — *accidentiam*: it is only in this passage that the word has a strongly verbal sense: "a supervening of the Spirit"; elsewhere the meaning is 'external influence' (e. g. 22, 2) or 'συμβεβηκός' (21, 7; 52, 2); see the note on 6, 5. — *operatrix*: a Tp, also found in 52, 3 and Hier.-Didym. *de spir. sanct.* 23; *operator* followed by an object. genit. occurs in *apol.* 46, 18, with *suus* perhaps *ib.* 23, 14.

5. Ambrosiaster in *Rom.* 9, 13 also mentions Saul and Judas as instances of a '*conversio in alium virum*'. — *accidens res est*: for the circumlocution by means of *res*, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 96/7. — *Saulem*: *res.* 55 (115, 9/11): *quodsi et transfigurationem et conversionem in transitum substantiae cuiusque defendis, ergo et Saulus in alium virum conversus de corpore suo excessit?* This passage too shows why Tert. exerts himself to represent Saul's *conversio* as no more than an *accidens*. For the use of *an* (Vulg. *num*), see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 2₁. — *mali* is the correct reading, *malus* here being a subst. = *diabolus*, as in 47, 2; *cult. fem.* 2, 5, 4; *ad ux.* 2, 7, etc.; cf. Kok, 156; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 99 *seqq.* — *vertit A] evertit B* Gel. Tert. never uses *evertit* with *in c. accus.*; cf., however, *praescr.* 3, 8 (copied by [Cypr.] *ad Novat.*

14 = 64, 19 H.): *Saul, bonus prae ceteris, livore postea evertitur. — apostatam*: cf. 57, 9. — *usque . . . officium*: for the use of *usque ad* (which may be a Grecism, cf. e. g. Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 2, 257: ἤδη δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀχρὶ καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ὀρώμεν διαστελλομένου ἀμφιβολίας), cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 3 (428, 6/7): *si apostolos praevaricationis et simulationis suspectos Marcion haberi queritur usque ad evangelii depravationem*; *ad uz.* 1, 6; *res.* 42 (87, 5); *S H A Aurelian.* 26, 1: *in obsidione usque ad ictum sagittae periclitatus est*, etc.; Müller-Marquardt, 189; Koch, *Novat.*, 286. — *loculorum*: *Joh.* 12, 6: ἀλλ' ὅτι κλέπτῃς (*fraudatorem*) ἦν καὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχε καὶ τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν. — *traditorem*: 'traitor', frequently used in connection with Judas, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 28 (375, 17); 3, 7 (387, 23 = *adv. Iud.* 14, 45/6); 4, 40 (559, 13); *praescr.* 3, 34; 22, 24 (but *proditor pat.* 3 (4, 6); *Iren. lat.* 2, 32, 1 gives both qualifications); cf. Mohrm., *Aug.*, 217; Goelzer, *Avit.*, 507. — *diabolus intravit*: *Ioh.* 13, 27: εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ σατανᾶς; *Luc.* 22, 3: εἰσῆλθε δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν (*adv. Marc.* 5, 6 (590, 13): *scriptum est enim apud me satanam in Iudam introisse*). Like St. John, who believed the devil to have entered the body of Judas after his eating a piece of bread (13, 26/7: Καὶ ἐμβάψας τὸ ψωμίον δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτῃ. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ σατανᾶς; cf. Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 95 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 134, 3/4): *venit diabolus, et accepit buccellam, et statim intravit satanas in illum*), Tert. has a very concrete idea of this 'entrance'. Similar views are expressed by Origen, who calls the devil *adscensor Iudae* (*homil. in Exod.* 6, 2; cf. *comm. in Matth.*, frag. 280 (G C S Orig. XII 1, p. 125): 'the ἀγαθός is ἀνεπίβατος τῷ δαίμονι, the φαῦλος ἱππῆλατος . . . τῷ πονηρῷ πατρὶ' and Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 144), and Petr. Chrysol. (*serm.* 104 (491 A): *quia ad eius* (sc. Iudae) *penetralia iam diabolus possessor insederat* and 19 (251 B): *ubi se diabolus Iudae animo immiscuit*). Cf. also Eustath. *de engastrim.* 13: (ὁ διάβολος) εἰς τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐντρόσθια παρεισδύς; *Pass. Barthol.* 6 (*Act. apost. apocr.* II, 1: 143, 1/2), where the demon says: *nos . . . migramus ad animam*; *Act. Andr. et Matth.* 25; *Act. Petr. et Andr.* 8; [*Clem.*] *homil.* 9, 10 (cf. Arbesmann, 21 *seqq.*). From pagan literature we may adduce the famous passage from Porphyrius quoted by Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 4, 23 (*de philos. ex orac. haur.*, p. 148 Wolff): Καὶ τὰ σώματα τοίνυν μεστὰ ἀπὸ τούτων (sc. τῶν πονηρῶν δαιμόνων) καὶ γὰρ μάλιστα ταῖς ποιαῖς τροφαῖς χαιρουσιν. Σιτουμένων γὰρ ἡμῶν προσίασι καὶ προσιζάνουσι τῷ σώματι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ ἀγνεῖται, οὐ διὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσηγουμένως, ἀλλ' ἐν' οὗτοι ἀποστῶσι. For more particulars, see Norden, *op. cit.*, 145/6; Cumont, *Afterlife*, 122; Dölger, *Exorzismus*, 24/5; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 20 and *Hellen. Myster.*, 44; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 236; 2, 7. 67. 102; Bauer's note on *Joh.* 8, 44 (*Hdb. N. T.* 6, p. 128).

6. *nativitate*: 'from birth'; this sense, which is found from Min. Fel. and Tert. downwards, is particularly frequent in the works of lawyers (see Cooper, 43 and Goelzer, *Jér.*, 103). Tert. mostly writes *a*, not *ex-te*, e. g. 37, 5; 52, 2; *exh. cast.* 1, 17; *v. v.* 11. In 24, 2 the sense

is 'the fact of being born', τὸ γεγενῆσθαι, in 28, 1 and *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (515, 18) 'generation'; cf. Thielmann, A. L. L. 8, 239; Rönisch, *It.*², 52. — *conseritur animae*: likewise, 25, 8: *quo facilius anima cum anima conseretur*. — On *utriusque* La Cerda rightly remarks: "illud *spiritus utriusque* valet *utriusvis*, *alterutrius*, nam simul coire nequeunt"; a parallel is found in *apol.* 1, 5: *itaque utrumque ex alterutro redarguimus*. For the reverse (*alteruter* = *uterque*), which is more frequent, see *Thes.* I. L. I: 1759, 72/7; Thielmann, A. L. L. 7, 377 *seqq.*; Paucker, *Suppl.*, 24; Elg, 28. — *atque ita* very often occurs in conclusions (in *de an.*: 12, 1; 25, 5; 34, 1; 37, 5); cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 122; Kroll, *Glotta* 15 (1926), 285; Keil's note on *Cato agric.* 54, 4; Bendz, *Frontin.*, 190; Hand, *Tursell.*, 1, 500 *seq.*; Rothstein's note on *Prop.* 2, 29, 21. — *ex substantiae suae sorte* = *ex substantia quam sortita est*, cf. 16, 2: (*natura*) *quam a deo anima nostra sortita est*. Similarly, 43, 9: *de naturae sortibus* = *de naturalibus quae sortiti sumus* (*Plin. n. h.* 9, 18: *ut credam etiam omnia in aquis spirare naturae suae sorte*); *adv. Marc.* 1, 7 (299, 12/3): *ex substantiae lege, non ex nominis sorte*. This paragraph very clearly shows that Tert. does not believe in a trichotomy spirit-soul-flesh (for which see Burton, *Amer. Journ. of Theol.* 18 (1914), 395 *seqq.*; 571 *seqq.*; 20 (1916), 390 *seqq.*; 563 *seqq.*) any more than St. Paul (for 1 *Thess.* 5, 23, see the notes by Dibelius (*Hdb. N. T.* 11, p. 32) and von Dobschütz, and Festugière, *L'idéal relig. des gr. et l'évang.*, 196 *seqq.*).

12. *Soul and mind.*

"The mind, the *animus* or *mens*, is a power proper to the soul, through which it acts and thinks, and so is no more an independent substance than the *spiritus*.

It often seems as if the soul is moved by the mind as by something essentially different from it, as was asserted by those thinkers who regard the *νοῦς* as the moving force of the universe (§ 1). Anaxagoras, for instance, declared that the mind is the origin of all things, and that it is completely pure and cannot mix with any other thing, whereas elsewhere he identified it with the soul (§ 2). This is disapproved of by Aristotle, who all the same is more capable of rebuking others than of finding a satisfactory solution himself. For, whilst he delayed giving a conclusive definition of the mind, he provisionally proclaimed another *νοῦς*, a divine one, which he declared to be impassible and consequently separated from the soul. For the soul is passible; hence the mind must be so too, if it is connected with the soul. If the mind is impassible, it cannot be connected with the soul; but in that case the soul cannot perceive or think through the mind (§ 3). According to Aristotle, sense-perception is a 'passion'; but sense-perception takes place together with, and by means of, the mind (§ 4). So it follows that the mind may come into touch with other things and so is passible. If, on the other hand, mind and soul are supposed to be separate powers, one of them will be idle (§ 5). Hence we are entitled to assume that both powers are one, and that Democritus is right

in making them identical. Only one question remains, viz. whether they are one by the blending of two substances, or on account of the particular nature of one single being. At all events, we regard the mind not as a substance separated from the soul, but as a fundamental function of the soul (§ 6)".

First of all, we must speak about the use of the terms *anima* and *animus*. The translation of νοῦς by *animus* needs no explanation; on the other hand, *anima* during the classical period usually denotes the vital power, not the soul as a whole, which is generally also called *animus*, e. g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 10, 20: *Plato triplicem finxit animum* (cf. M. Schulze, *Die Schrift des Claudianus Mamertus über das Wesen der Seele* (Leipsic 1883), 64; Bömer, 20/1; Mayor's note on Iuven. 15, 147 seqq.). The meaning of the words in the archaic and classical periods appears from antithetic definitions such as Accius *trag.* 296: *sapimus animo, fruimur anima*; Non. Marc. 426: *animus est quo sapimus, anima qua vivimus*; Gramm. Lat., VII 531 Keil: *animus qualitas viventis, anima causa vitae*; Serv. in *Aen.* 10, 487. Lucretius (3, 94/117) uses *animus* to denote the λογικόν, *anima* as a translation of τὸ ἄλογον. However, in his poem "the *animus* is not only the seat of the intellect, but also of the will, the passions, and the desires, whereas the *anima* is the power which gives and maintains life without any reference to intellectual activity" (Heinze, *Lucr.* III, 63); in the passage just quoted there is nothing about the antithesis νοῦς—ψυχή. As far as I know, Apuleius is the first author who uses *anima* as a name for the entire soul. In *apol.* 49 he still writes: *de nostri quoque animi trinis potestatibus*, but in *de Plat.* 1, 13 (97, 2/3 Thom.): *at enim cum tres partes animae ducat esse* (sc. Plato); cf. *ib.* 1, 18 (102, 5). Henceforth *anima* remains the usual translation of ψυχή (cf. e. g. Wack, *Synt.*, 2, 13/4; Wohleb, *Didache*, 63/4). Here again Lactantius proves himself a *Cicero Christianus* by adopting the usage of the classical period (e. g. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 9/10 and *opif. dei* 17; see Schulze, *loc. cit.*).

Nearly all the materials worked up in this chapter can eventually be traced back to Aristotle's περὶ ψυχῆς; this applies to the δόξα of Anaxagoras with its refutation (§ 2), to the note concerning Democritus (§ 6), and above all to the paragraphs referring to Aristotle himself (§§ 3/4). More than once we find literal translations of the text of Aristotle (see the comm.); hence we may draw the conclusion that all these data were borrowed by Tert. from Soranus (see also Karpp, 37). It is fairly certain that Soranus here too followed the Stoics, who regarded the νοῦς as a power not separated from the ψυχή, so that we are entitled to assume that he combated the view of Aristotle; hence it is quite possible that the polemical part of the chapter, too, was copied from him; this supposition finds a strong support in the tribute paid to Democritus, a philosopher highly estimated by Soranus (cf. Introduction, ch. V).

1. *sive mens est νοῦς apud Graecos*: it is certainly wrong to follow Pamelius in putting a comma after *est*. For this use of *sive*, cf. e. g.

ad nat. 1, 10, 43: *Varro trecentos Ioves, seu Iuppiteros dicendum est, . . . inducit* ("Ioves, or Iuppiteri, if that is to be their name"; similarly, in the present passage: "*animus*, or *mens*, if that corresponds to the Greek word νοῦς"); Vitruv. 4, 6, 4: *ancones, sive parotides vocantur*. *ib.* 10, 21 (15), 3: *in arbusculis, sive amaxopodes dicuntur*; Hor. *sat.* 2, 6, 20: *Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis*. Cf. the similar use of εἶτε in Greek, e. g. Dio Chrysost. *orat.* 36, 23 (II: 7, 7 Arnim): μίαν . . . δὴ ταύτην καθαρῶς εὐδαίμονα πολιτείαν εἶτε καὶ πόλιν χρὴ καλεῖν. For further particulars, see C. F. W. Müller, *Die Partikel sive*, 15/21; Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.*, 2, 234; Norden, *Agn. Theos*, 144 *seqq.* — **non aliud quid intellegimus**: A B have *quo non*, which is impossible, and may be due to the following *q u o agit, q u o sapit*. Hartel's conjecture (*animus* for *animum*), which offers a possibility to retain *quo*, renders *proinde* senseless, for the meaning of the present passage cannot be "consequently, the *animus* or *mens* is that which the Greeks call νοῦς"; *proinde* intimates that the discussion of the unity of the soul is continued, and that the *animus* is no more an isolated power than the *spiritus* (ch. 11). Tert. regards *anima* and *mens* as synonyms in a much higher degree than Lucretius does (3, 94: *animum . . . mentem quam saepe vocamus*), who uses *animus* to denote the λογικόν, not the νοῦς (see the preface to the present chapter; Ernout-Robin's note on Lucr. 3, 615; Heinze, *op. cit.*, 63). — **suggestum**: 'power'; cf. the note on 1, 1. — **nativitus**: according to Forcellini, this word (not mentioned in Hoppe's lists) only occurs in Tert.'s works; it is also found in 39, 1. — **motator** is Tp (also in *ad nat.* 2, 3, 11. 15 and Arnob. 3, 31). — **illum deum Socratis**: Pamelius refers to *apol.* 47, 7: *intra mundum* (sc. deum putant) *Platonici, qui gubernatoris exemplo intra id maneat quod regat*, which has nothing to do with the present passage. La Cerda adduces *Phaedo* 97 B/C, where Socrates says: 'Ἄλλ' ἀκούσας μὲν ποτε ἐκ βιβλίου τινός, ὡς ἔφη, Ἀναξαγόρου ἀναγιγνώσκοντος, καὶ λέγοντος, ὡς ἔρα νοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ διακοσμῶν τε καὶ πάντων αἴτιος, etc. It is indeed not impossible that Tert. has an inaccurate recollection of this passage (which he may have read in the original, cf. Introduction, p. 44* note 6), and so represents Socrates' words about Anaxagoras as containing the opinion of Socrates himself (Tert. is often inaccurate, particularly when dealing with subjects which are of no direct importance for his argument; cf. the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3); at any rate, the words ὡς ἔρα νοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ διακοσμῶν τε καὶ πάντων αἴτιος accord rather well with *universitatis motatorem*. According to d'Alès (Rev. Ét. Gr. 50 (1937), 335₄), Tert. means the δαίμόνιον of Socrates. Though his arguments are far from convincing, this explanation may perhaps be supported by pointing out that Tert. regarded Socrates' δαίμόνιον as a demon (see the note on 1, 4), and that the νοῦς is frequently called δαίμων in philosophical literature (e. g. the hymn of Cleanthes, vs. 15; Sen. *ep.* 31, 11; Epictet. 1, 14, 6; 2, 8, 11; M. Aurel. 5, 27; 10, 13; Philo *de provid.* 2, 16; for Posidonius, cf. Galen *Hippocr. et Plat. placit.*, p. 469 Müller). However, the most plausible solution is to assume here an allusion to a passage of the *Philebus* (quoted in 24, 3 about the value

of memory), where Philebus says to Socrates (28 B): σεμνύνεις γάρ, ὦ Σώκρατες, τὸν σεαυτοῦ θρόνον, i. e. the νοῦς (cf. *ib.* 28 C: πάντες γὰρ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ σοφοί, ἑαυτοὺς ὄντως σεμνύνοντες, ὡς νοῦς ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, cf. Tert.: *universitatis motatorem*). Xen. *memor.* 1, 4, 17, which may also be compared, diverges more widely from the present passage: ὠγαθέ, ἔφη, κατὰμαθε δτι καὶ ὁ σὸς νοῦς ἐνὼν τὸ σὸν σῶμα ὅπως βούλεται μεταχειρίζεται. οἶσθαι οὖν χρὴ καὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ παντὶ φρόνησιν τὰ πάντα, ὅπως ἂν αὐτῇ ἡδὺ ᾖ, οὕτω τίθεσθαι. — Valentini... ΣΙΓΗΙ: the reading *Unigenitum* (A; *Monogenen* B Gel) may perhaps be retained, though in *adv. Val.* 7 (185, 2) *Monogenes* is found. Cf. *Iren.* 1, 1, 1: *Nun autem hunc, et Unigenitum vocant, et Patrem et initium omnium* (Tert.: *univ. mot.*).

2. *Quam* is certainly right, cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 125. — *Initium*, etc.: this theory is often mentioned in doxographical literature (though not by Aëtius), for instance in Theophrast. *phys. opin.* frag. 4 (*DDG* 479, 7/8): τῆς δὲ κινήσεως καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αἴτιον ἐπέστησε τὸν νοῦν ὁ 'Α.; *id.*, *frag. de sens.* 38 (510, 10/1 *ib.*); Hermias *Irrisio* 6 (652, 24 *seqq. ib.*); Hippolyt. *refut.* 8, 1 (561, 24 *ib.*). — *oscillum* (also *pall.* 1, 3: *arrietem... dicitur Carthago... armasse in o. penduli impetus*) here denotes the περιχώρησις (Anax. B 9. 12, Diels). — *purumque*: *ib.* B 12: μέμεικται οὐδενὶ χρήματι, ἀλλὰ μόνος αὐτὸς ἐπ' ἑωυτοῦ ἐστίν... ἐστὶ γὰρ λεπτότατόν τε πάντων χρημάτων καὶ καθαρώτατον. *incommiscibilem*: ἄ. λ. — *animam edicit* is to be preferred to *animae addicit*: it makes better sense and deviates less from the *lectio tradita*. Cf. Arist. *de anim.* 1, 2 (405a 13 *seqq.*): 'Α. δ' ἔοικε μὲν ἕτερον λέγειν ψυχὴν τε καὶ νοῦν... χρῆται δ' ἀμφοῖν ὡς μιᾷ φύσει, πλὴν ἀρχὴν γε τὸν νοῦν τίθεται μάλιστα πάντων· μόνον γοῦν φησὶν τῶν ὄντων ἀπλοῦν εἶναι καὶ ἀμιγῇ τε καὶ καθαρὸν (Tert.: *purum... et simplicem et incommiscibilem*).

3. *Hoc etiam Aristoteles denotavit*: for Aristotle's criticism of Anaxagoras, cf. the passages collected by F. Nuyens, *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de zielkunde van Aristoteles* (Nijmegen 1939), 120₂₈, especially *de anim.* 1, 2 (404b 1 *seqq.*): 'Αναξ. δ' ἥττον διασαφεῖ περὶ αὐτῶν· πολλαχοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ καλῶς καὶ ὀρθῶς τὸν νοῦν λέγει, ἐτέρωθι δὲ τοῦτον εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν (Tert. *et tamen eundem alibi animam edicit*; the passage from Arist. supports the constitution of the text according to Gelen.) — *nescio an*: 'probably not', cf. the note on 1, 2. — *inanire* is found here for the first time in the sense of 'irritum reddere', 'abolere'; of course in this passage this meaning is primarily due to the antithesis (*implere*). — *definitionem... differret*: *de anim.* 2, 2 (413b 24/5): περὶ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς θεωρητικῆς δυνάμεως οὐδὲν πω φανερόν, ἀλλ' ἔοικε ψυχῆς γένος ἕτερον εἶναι (Tert. wrongly *alterum animi*, not -ae, *genus*, probably on account of the words *definitionem... differret*). — *divinum... impassibilem*: cf. *de anim.* 3, 5 (430a 17 *seqq.*): καὶ οὗτος ὁ νοῦς χωριστὸς καὶ ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀμιγής; cf. *de gen. animal.* 2, 3 (736b 27 *seqq.*): λείπεται δὲ τὸν νοῦν μόνον

θύραθεν ἐπειστέναι καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον· οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κοινωνεῖ σωματικῇ ἐνέργειᾳ. — **inpassibilem**: Tp.; cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 115; Goelz., *Jér.*, 136; *Avit.*, 484. — **subostendens**: Tp; also in *bapt.* 19, 2; *adv. Herm.* 37 (167, 11); *adv. Marc.* 4, 38 (550, 10), *adv. Val.* 1 (178, 7). — **et ipse eum**, not *et ipsum* (Rfd) is the correct reading: Aristotle as well as Anaxagoras separated the νοῦς from the ψυχή. For the construction of the sentence, cf. e. g. § 1 *quem . . . ab illo*; *res.* 2 (28, 9/11): *viderit unus aliqui Lucanus nec huic quidem substantiae parcens, quam secundum Aristotelem dissolvens aliud quid pro ea subicit*; *ib.* 37 (79, 21/2): *quasi non liceat esse aliquid, quod etsi nihil prosit, aliud tamen ei prodesse possit?*; *spect.* 22 (22, 23/5): *quadrigarios . . . quibus viri animas, feminae autem illis etiam corpora sua substernunt*; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 714/5; Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 324/5; Lebreton, *Ét.*, 100; Dahllöf, 130; Juret, *Fil.*, 156; Sörbom, 129. — **consortio**: cf. the note on 2, 2; *paen.* 3, 6: *carnis et spiritus, quorum . . . tantum communionis atque consortii est*; *res.* 5 (32, 21 seq.). — **passibilem . . . eorum**: the genit. is used on the analogy of *patiens* with an objective genit., *passibilis* being equivalent to a present partic. (see Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 86/7). For the infin. after *sortita est*, see the note on 8, 4. **Impassibilis** is Tp. — **Cum enim . . . nihil patitur**: this passage may be paraphrased as follows: "Aristotle censured Anaxagoras for detaching the *animus* from the *anima*. However (*rursus*), by qualifying the *animus* as *impassibilis*, he did exactly the same himself, for (*enim* explains *quem rursus . . . a consortio animae*) there are two possibilities [the second of which is no more than the logical inversion of the first; the expression of the argument is confused, because the words *aut . . . aut* suggest an alternative which is not found here]: A. 1. If the *animus* is connected with the *anima*, the *anima* undergoes all influences (*patietur*) through or together with the *animus*. 2. If this is the case, the *animus* cannot be *impassibilis* <, so that Aristotle's assertion of the contrary is wrong>. B. 1. <If the *animus* is *impassibilis* indeed, the soul cannot undergo influences through or together with the *animus*>. 2. If this is impossible (*aut si non per animum, nec cum animo patietur anima*), the soul is not connected with the *animus* <, which is the very assertion censured by Aristotle>." In the first part of the sentence the words *non poterit animus impassibilis induci* are only loosely connected with what precedes; this is due to the fact that two sentences have been confused: A. *Cum enim animam . . . si concreta est anima*, the evident conclusion that the *animus* is *passibilis* being omitted; B. *cum enim animam . . . sortita est pati, si concreta est . . . induci*. — **cui nihil patitur**: instead of *cui* Junius suggests *per quem*, Ursinus *qui*. We may, however, retain *cui*, which of course corresponds to *per quem* in the preceding sentences, by comparing *res.* 12 (41, 27/9): *et utique si omnia homini resurgunt, cui procurata sunt, porro non homini nisi et carni, quale est, ut ipsa depereat in totum propter quam et cui nihil deperit?* See also Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 45. — **Porro**, etc.: the latter part of this paragraph and § 4 contain a further refutation of Aristotle: "Not only Aristotle asserts the same as Anaxagoras, but he is also (*porro*) contradicted by common

experience. According to Aristotle, the *animus* does not undergo the influences undergone by the soul (*si nihil . . . patietur*); now Aristotle himself admits, and human reason teaches us (*quidni?*), that sense-perception, thoughts, and notions are *passiones*, so that, if Aristotle were right indeed, the soul would do all these things without the *animus*. But (*autem*) experience (*videmus*) proves the very opposite of this <, so that the *animus* cannot possibly be *impassibilis*>”.

4. Nam, etc.: this, too, derives from Arist. *de anim.*, e. g. 2, 5 (416b 33/5): ἡ δ' αἰσθησις ἐν τῷ κινεῖσθαι τε καὶ πάσχειν συμβαίνει, καθάπερ εἴρηται· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἀλλοίωσίν τις εἶναι, or *ib.* 2, 11 (424a 1): τὸ γὰρ αἰσθάνεσθαι πάσχειν τι ἐστίν (cf. also *phys.* 7, 2 = 244b 13). The addition *quia pati sentire est* is strange, for it is not only incorrect, but also quite unnecessary to the argument; it is probably due to force of habit (cf. the note on the last sentence of 7, 4; we may, however, perhaps refer to Herm. Trismeg. *ap. Stob.* I 275, 11 Wachsm.: πᾶν τὸ πάσχον αἰσθεται, πᾶν τὸ αἰσθόμενον πάσχει). The words *moveri sentire est* contain the inversion of an assertion made by Aristotle (ἡ δ' αἰσθησις ἐν τῷ κινεῖσθαι . . . συμβαίνει); they are necessary here to get a connection between *moveri* and *pati* (*movere* = *sentire* = *pati*). — For *quia* with a subjunctive in Tert.'s works (— *itur* B Gel), cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 76.

5. commiscibilis: ἀλ. — *Iam ergo* is very common in Tert.'s works, cf. *Thes.* I. L. V, 2: 774, 79/80 and VII, 1: 129, 37/44. — *sapor* here has the meaning of *sapere*, which is very rare: Cic. *post redit. in sen.* 6, 14: *sine sensu, sine sapore, elinguem, tardum*; Pelag. *in ep. ad Rom.* 1, 21: *evanuerunt a naturali sapore*; a word-play is found in *Cypr. ep.* 63, 11 (the subject of the principal sentence is *calix dominicus*): *ut a sapore isto saeculari ad intellectum dei unusquisque resipiscat*. — *nulla causa* is opposed to *actus et motus*, as *otium* to *passio*, *quies* to *sensus*, and *stupor* to *sapor*. — *vacabit*: 'will be idle'; cf. also the note on 44, 1.

6. reputari = deputari; this meaning (frequent in juridical literature) is very common in Tert.'s works; cf. Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 73; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 83. — Democritus: again from Aristotle, *de anim.* 1, 2 (404a 27/8): ὥσπερ Δ.· ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς ψυχὴν ταῦτόν τε καὶ νοῦν (cf. *ib.* 405a 9). — *obtinebit*: 'will be put in the right' (Cic. writes *o. causam* or *litem*). This is a law term again, cf. e. g. Ulp. *dig.* 2, 4, 4, 2: *quod et honestius est et merito obtinuit*; Paulus *ib.* 4, 8, 30 and 42, 1, 36. From Tert. cf. *spect.* 18 (19, 27); *adv. Herm.* 33 (163, 1); *apol.* 50, 3; *c. Chr.* 6, 29/30; see also Heumann-Seckel⁹, 384. — *substantia alium*: an ablat. *limitationis* after *alius* (also in § 1) is found from Liv. 1, 56, 7 downwards; on *apol.* 8, 5: *alii nos, opinor, natura* cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 31; Waltz., *Ét.*, 181; see also *Thes.* I. L. I: 1651, 37 *seqq.* — *officium* in this passage means 'function', not 'servant' as in 37, 1 and 40, 4.

13. *The soul takes precedence of the mind.*

"It is evident that the soul is more important than the mind, for we often say 'soul' to denote the whole human being (§ 1). Instances of this usage are found in everyday speech; furthermore, both philosophers and physicians always give the title 'On the Soul' to books on these subjects, even if they include a discussion of the mind (§ 2). Finally, in Holy Scripture the soul plays a much more essential part than the mind. So we may be certain that the soul is more important indeed, and that its substance forms a unity, which uses the mind as an instrument (§ 3)".

The argument is based on the *sensus communes* (see the note on 2, 1) and on scriptural texts, and is to be regarded as Tert.'s intellectual property.

1. *dispicere* (often in Cic., Sen., and Plin. *ep.*, rare elsewhere) is used by Tert. twenty-four times (Thes. I. L. V, 1: 1415, 21/3); perhaps this frequent use is due to the influence of juridical Latin. *despicere* instead of *dispicere* (the two verbs are frequently confounded in manuscripts; cf. Thes. I. L. V, 1: 743, 26 and 1415, 15) is also given by A in *ad nat.* 1, 10, 44 (= *apol.* 15, 1, where Martin wrongly adopts the reading *despicite* of the manuscripts). — *principalitas* (Tp) here means τὸ ἡγεμονοῦν; the meaning 'priority' occurs in *praescr.* 31, 1 and *Iren.* 3, 3, 1: *propter potentioorem principalitatem* (sc. ecclesiae Romanae; 'διὰ τὸ ἐξάριετον πρωτεῖον' Salmasius; 'Alterthümlichkeit', 'Ursprünglichkeit' Stieren; Harvey's interpretation (2, 9,) is wrong). In *Macrob. somn. Scip.* 1, 3, 12 *genera principalitatis* is equivalent to *genera principalia*. For the Latin translation of ἡγεμονικόν, see the note on 15, 1. — *sit . . . praest.* in indirect questions Tert. very rarely uses different moods (not discussed in Hoppe's works). This idiom is found already in archaic Latin (rarely; usually for metrical reasons, cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 695), in *Rhet. Herenn.* (*ib.*, 694), and in Varro (*Dahlmann*, 51), in poetry from Propert. downwards (cf. also *Sudhaus, Aetna*, 90/1). Its occurrence in classical prose is doubtful (*Hofm., op. cit.*, 839); in prose of the imperial period it is more common (*Hofm., loc. cit.*; for *Colum.*, see *Nyström*, 85/6 and *Dahlöf*, 115, for *Celsus*, *Lyngby*, 16, for *Quint. declam.*, *Y. Englund*, 74/5, and *Wahlén*, 159), after *Apul.* it is widely used: cf. *Kroll, Synt.*, 55; *Médan*, 99; *Tidn., Did.*, 46; *Friebel*, 93; *Baehr., Beitr.*, 516 *seqq.*; *Hagendahl, Ammian.*, 122 *seqq.* — *cuius principalitas apparuerit*: οὗτου τὸ ἡγεμονοῦν φαίνεται ὅν. Similarly, *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (460, 28/9): *bene, quod caelum nullius alterius usque adhuc dei apparet* (sc. ὅν), *nisi cuius et terra*; cf. *ib.* 4, 41 (562, 2/4): *et cur non magis passurus esset, si alterius dei ac per hoc adversarium creatoris manifestasset* (εἰ ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ἑτέρου θεοῦ ὄντα . . . ἔφηνεν; for the omission of *se*, which was wrongly inserted by *Junius* and *Kroymann*, cf. *Löfst., Z. Spr. Tert.*, 50) and 1, 16 (311, 27/8): *cuius nec modica comparent*. With a *nomin.* e. g. *adv. Herm.* 45 (175, 10/1): *apparere coepit et . . . conveniri deus*; *Suet. rhetor.* 1: *paulatim et ipsa* (sc. *rhetorica*) *utilis honestaque apparuit* (ὠφέλιμος . . . οὔσα

ἐφαίνετο). For the necessity to understand ὅν, cf. the note on 5, 4. — *substantiae massa* means no more than 'the whole substance'. The choice of the word is undoubtedly due to the *corporalitas animae*, which in 37, 6 is compared to a *massa auri vel argenti*; cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 18 (478, 13 *seqq.*), where Tert. argues that the *portio spiritus sancti* which had lodged in St. John the Baptist, should *abscedere iam ab Iohanne redactam scilicet in dominum ut in massalem suam summam*. — *mentio* is often used by Tert. in the sense of 'denomination' or 'notion', cf. Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 105/6; we may add *adv. Herm.* 3 (128, 23/4): *substantia semper fuit cum suo nomine, quod est deus; postea domini, accedentis scilicet rei, mentio*, and 19 (147, 16/8): *sed cum ita utimur vocabulo principii, quasi originis, non quasi ordinis nomine, adicimus et mentionem ipsius rei specialiter, quam volumus principium alterius rei*. — *titulata*: Tp., also *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 15) and 3, 13 (398, 24; = *adv. Iud.* 9, 106). This word seems to be used by Christian authors only (for more instances, cf. the *Addenda* to my *Index Verborum*, p. 257); in *carm. de resurr. mort.* 2 (p. 47 of my edition) the verb has a different meaning ('distinguere' > 'ornare').

2. The locutions adduced as arguments in this paragraph are heterogeneous. It is only in the first two that *anima* is really equivalent to ζῶον, *homo* (cf. 24, 11); the next two show the meaning 'vital power' (or even 'life-breath'), whereas the last-mentioned example probably refers to Greek works περὶ ψυχῆς (it is hardly conceivable that many Latin works with the title *De anima* should have been written before Tert.: cf. the preface to ch. 12, p. 201). The whole passage is to be regarded as an appeal to the *sensus communes* (cf. the notes on 2, 1 and 25, 3). — *ait . . . ait*: a similar repetition occurs in *c. Chr.* 12, 36: *et veni, inquit, animam salvam facere, non dixit, ostendere*. — *rusticus . . . miles*: instances of everyday life, cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 7 (595, 13): *exempla praemiserat (Christus) militum pastorum rusticorum* (*apol.* 42, 3); 2 Tim. 2, 3/6; Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 128; Norden, *Neue Jahrb.*, N. F., Suppl. 18 (1892), 295₃; my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 172. — *nominatiora*: only one other instance of this comparative is known, viz. *Aug. civ. dei* 16, 2, 1: *quid . . . nominatius Christo?*; for other instances of comparatives of partic. in Tert., see Kellner, *Spr. Tert.*, 232. — *agere*: this example may be due to Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 19: *nam et agere animam et efflare dicimus; ipse autem animus ab anima dictus est*. — *ipsique medici*: of course Tert. in the first place thinks of Soranus. — *faciem . . . operis*: similarly, Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 95 (467 A): *quod erat in facie lectionis* (oppos.: *interna eius*); Claud. Mam. *de stat. anim.* 1, 2 (24, 10 Eng.). — *frontemque materiae*: cf. Hier. *ep.* 29, 2, 1 and Ennod. *ep.* 2, 24: *in fronte epistulae*; [Rufin.] in *Os.* 1, 1; Cassiodor. in *Ps.* 15 *praef.*: *inscriptiones titulorum qui psalmorum frontibus affiguntur*; from Tert. cf. *pud.* 5 (226, 22/3): *in prima . . . fronte sanctissimae legis*. — *proscripsit* = *inscripsit*, just as *res.* 18 (49, 15): *quonam titulo spes ista proscripita sit*; *ad nat.* 1, 14, 1: *picturam . . . proposuit sub ista proscriptione* (*apol.* 16, 12: *cum eiusmodi inscriptione*; *pud.* 5 (226, 24). — On this passage Karpp, 38 remarks: "Ihn (viz.

the usage which prefers *anima* (ψυχή) to *animus* or νοῦς) bezeugen auch die Schriftsteller, welche zwar von einem *animus* reden, aber ihre Werke *De anima* (περὶ ψυχῆς) betiteln. Solche Leute kennt Tertullian aus Soran; denn er bezeichnet sie als *ipsi* . . . *philosophi ipsique medici* und gibt damit sein medizinisch-philosophisches Handbuch zu erkennen. Soran, welcher ja nach an. 10 und 15 selbst eine einheitliche Seelensubstanz annahm, hat jenen Einwurf vielleicht schon selbst erhoben, mindestens aber den Tertullian mit jenen Schriftstellern bekannt gemacht". Tert., in writing *medici*, is more likely to have thought of Soranus only; similarly, *philosophi* may refer to no more than one book, e. g. Aristotle's περὶ ψυχῆς.

3. Ut . . . a deo discas: cf. 43, 9: *si apud deum discas* (which there too introduces the 'Christian' part of the chapter), and the note on 1, 6. — *salvam* . . . *facere*: according to Harnack (*Marcion*, 180*), this translation was borrowed from the Gospel of Marcion, because Tert., after quoting from this work Luc. 9, 24, where this expression occurs (*adv. Marc.* 4, 21 = 489, 25/6), in his own discussion of the passage (*ib.* 490, 14) writes *servat*. Since, however, *salvam facere* is also found in several places where the influence of the Gospel of Marcion is out of the question (cf. Matzkow, 18/25, especially 21), Harnack's conclusion seems to be wrong. Here Tert. refers to Luc. 9, 56. — *illam* . . . *comminatur*: Matth. 10, 28 (often quoted by Tert., cf. Aalders, 53/4); there are only two other passages (Apul. *met.* 8, 30 and Hesych. in *Lev.* 20, 6/8) where a present infin. without an accus. is found after this verb (cf. von Geisau, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 36, 273). — *illam* . . . *vetat* (sc. *quam se*): Luc. 14, 26: εἰ τις . . . οὐ μισεῖ . . . τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν, οὐ δύναται μου μαθήτης εἶναι; cf. *fuga* 7, 3: *qui pluris fecerit animam suam quam me*; *scorp.* 11 (170, 6/7); *ib.* 14 (177, 24/5): *ceterum super deum diligere nec animam licebit*. I cannot assume here an allusion to Ioh. 12, 25 (as is supposed by H. Koch, *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1934, 158). — *illam* . . . *ponit*: Ioh. 10, 11: ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθεισιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων; *ib.* 10, 15 (*adv. Prax.* 22 (269, 17/8): *quod animam suam ponat*). Cf. Aalders, 155, whose discussion of these passages needs some correction. Of course, the expression in Luc. 23, 46: πᾶτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου does not belong here. For *animam ponere*, see Tidn., *Did.*, 193. — *pecudibus* 'sheep', cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 79. However, in *fuga* 11, 1 Tert. writes: *bonus pastor animam pro pecoribus ponit*. — *Habes*, "now you know", is often found at the end of an argument or digression, cf. Seyffert, *Scholae latinae*, 1, 79. — *unio* = *unitas* occurs for the first time in Tert.: *adv. Val.* 37 (211, 7/9: *Unio* (≈ *Unitas*) as one of the *Virtutes* assumed by the Valentinians); *adv. Prax.* 13 (249, 7/8): *reductum est iam nomen dei et domini in unionem*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 5 (296, 19): *et duo enim multitudo, unione iam excessa*. It is often followed by a genit.: *mon.* 4: *unio coniugii*; *res.* 2 (27, 24): *de unione divinitatis* (*ib.* 28, 5/6; *adv. Prax.* 18 (260, 14); 19 (262, 19/20); 20 (263, 6); *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 = 295, 19. 296, 2). In the succeeding centuries this word (which only occurs in the works of Christian authors) is rarely

used, except by Hilar. and Hier. — *patrocinium* 'protection' > 'protector' (cf. the use of *ministerium* in 40, 2. 4). The concrete sense (though not employed to denote human beings) is also found in *res.* 18 (49, 1/2): *tot auctoritates iustorum patrociniorum . . . honores dico substantiae ipsius, tum vires dei, etc.*; *ad nat.* 2, 5, 4: *lunam, solacium noctium, patrocinium mensium*; cf. Beck, 123 and the comm. on 2, 4. — *instrumentum . . . patrocinium*: a similar antithesis occurs in *fuga* 2, 1: *iniquitatem non patrocinium praestare persecutioni, sed ministerium.*

14. *Different views about the parts of the soul. In how far can we speak of parts of the soul?*

"The soul, which is a single substance, is not divisible, as it is not dissoluble (if so, it would be mortal). (§ 1). By the philosophers it is divided into different parts in various ways (§ 2); it might, perhaps, be better to speak of faculties or powers of the soul (as was already done in some cases by Aristotle), for these 'parts' are not to be regarded as 'members of the substance of the soul' in the same sense as the members of the body, but as faculties (*ingenia*). Besides, even the body itself cannot be divided into parts as the philosophers divide the soul (§ 3); on the contrary, a multitude of members produces one body, so that, what is called a division, should rather be called a concretion. This is made clear by comparing the body to the hydraulic organ: the air-current pervading the entire instrument is not divided, though it is used in different parts (§ 4). It is in this sense that Strato, Aenesidemus, and Heraclitus speak of a diffusion of the soul throughout the body. — The various names of these 'parts' and their seats in the body are immaterial to us (§ 5)".

The short preface, in which Tert. emphasizes the indivisibility of the soul, is followed by a long doxographical survey, which, just as the information concerning Aristotle in § 3 (see the preface to ch. 12) and Aenesidemus in § 5 (see the note on 9, 5), has certainly been borrowed from Soranus (Karpp (35) rightly points out that of the philosophers and physicians quoted there he is the youngest). It is quite possible that the final sentence (*Haec omnia . . . sequestrentur*) also refers to Soranus, who was particularly interested in everything concerning terminology (cf. Karpp, *loc. cit.*). On the other hand, it is far from certain whether the comparison of the body to an organ was borrowed from the same source, as Tert. also uses it in a much earlier work; he may quite well have found it in popular philosophy (see the note on § 4).

1. *de suo*: cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 14; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 103; for other authors, Sverr., *Pallad.*, 314 and 640, for the inscriptions, H. Armini, *Eran.* 23 (1925), 22/3. — The reading *instruetilis* (A B Gel; *structilis* Kroym.) may be retained, though it gives a α . λ .; for the use of *instruo* = *struo*, see the note on 10, 3. *divisibilis* is Tp. A similar confutation of the trichotomy of the soul is given by Firm. Mat. *err. prof. relig.* 5, 4. Once again we should note the circumstantiality of the argument.

2. The progression of numbers in this doxographical survey betrays its Sceptical origin (cf. e. g. the list of ἀρχαί assumed by the δογματικοί in Sext. Emp. *adv. mathem.* 10, 313/8); almost certainly Soranus took it in this form from Aenesidemus (see the Introduction, p. 30*). — **in duas a Platone**: viz. τὸ λογικόν and τὸ ἔλογον: 16, 1: *Plato bifariam partitur animam, per rationale et irrationalē*; Aet. 4, 4, 1: Πυθαγόρας Πλάτων κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἀνωτάτω λόγον διμερῆ τὴν ψυχὴν. — **in tres a Zenone**: this information is rather surprising, as we are always told that Zeno divided the soul into eight parts (see the note on *in octo penes Chrysippum*); cf. also Orig. c. *Cels.* 5, 47 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 829): τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς, ἀρνούμενους τὸ τριμερὲς τῆς ψυχῆς. Wellmann (*Neue Jahrb.* 47 (1877), 807) supposes that Zeno regarded the five senses as belonging to the body, and so only considered the ἡγεμονικόν, φωνᾶν, and σπερματικόν to be parts of the soul. On the contrary, K. Schindler (*Die stoische Lehre von den Seelenteilen und Seelenvermögen insbesondere bei Panaitios und Poseidonios und ihre Verwendung bei Cicero* (thes. Munich 1934), 15/6) assumes that Zeno took together the five senses as the αἰσθητικόν, and did not include the ἡγεμονικόν in his calculation, so that the three parts were τὸ αἰσθητικόν, τὸ φωνητικόν, and τὸ σπερματικόν. See also Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und die Stoa*, 86. It seems hardly possible to arrive at a completely satisfactory conclusion; at all events, we should follow Schindler, *loc. cit.*, in rejecting the hypothesis of P. Barth (*Die Stoa*, 76₁), who assumes that the Stoics never divided the soul into eight parts, but only knew of a division into φύσις, ψυχὴ, and ἡγεμονικόν (for an equally improbable supposition with regard to Cleanthes, see Schindler, 31). — **in quinque ab Aristotele**: the words *ab Aristotele* were already rightly inserted by Pamelius, just as afterwards by Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 205. Junius' conjecture *a filio Nicomachi* seems to be due to Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 5, 20 (the passage has no parallel in Aëtius; see Diels, *op. cit.*, 390): ὁ δὲ Νικομάχου πέντε εἶναι ταύτης ἔφησεν ἐνεργείας τὴν ὀρεκτικὴν τὴν θρεπτικὴν τὴν αἰσθητικὴν τὴν μεταβατικὴν τὴν διανοητικὴν; the addition of the name of Nicomachus is rather common in doxographical lists, cf. e. g. Philo *de provid.* 1, 22. Of course Soranus referred to Arist. *de anim.* 2, 3 (414a 31): δυνάμεις δ' εἵπομεν θρεπτικόν, ὀρεκτικόν, αἰσθητικόν, κινητικόν κατὰ τόπον, διανοητικόν. — **in sex a Panaetio**: Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 15: Παναίτιος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος τὸ μὲν φωνητικόν τῆς καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεως μέρος εἶναι βούλεται, λέγων ὀρθότατα · τὸ δὲ σπερματικόν οὐ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος, ἀλλὰ τῆς φύσεως (cf. also *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 874 with Arnim's note). The passage gives rise to a difficulty, as the notions καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις and φύσις do not occur in the accounts of the Stoics' division of the soul; hence Fowler (*Panaet. et Hecat. frag.* (Bonn 1885), 15 *seqq.*) has questioned the correctness of the information given by Tert. and Nemesius. His view has been combated by Schmekel, *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa* (Berlin 1892), 201₁; but this scholar in his turn is wrong when, in his comparison of the two list of faculties of the soul given by Nemes. (*op. cit.*, ch. 15 and 26), he identifies the καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις with the ἡγεμονικόν and supposes the six parts in question to be

the ἡγεμονικόν and the five senses (see Schindler, 35/6). Schindler bases his interpretation on Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 26: διαιροῦσιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως τὰς κατὰ τὸ ζῶον δυνάμεις. καὶ τὰς μὲν λέγουσιν ψυχικάς, τὰς δὲ φυσικάς, τὰς δὲ ζωτικάς· ψυχικάς μὲν τὰς κατὰ προαίρεσιν· φυσικάς δὲ καὶ ζωτικάς τὰς ἀπροαίρετους· καὶ εἰσὶ ψυχικαὶ μὲν δύο, ἣ τε καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεις καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις. τῆς δὲ καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεως εἶδη [τρία] τὸ τε μεταβητικόν καὶ τὸ κινητικόν τοῦ σώματος παντὸς καὶ τὸ φωνητικόν καὶ τὸ ἀναπνευστικόν. ἐν ἡμῖν γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιεῖν. φυσικαὶ δὲ καὶ ζωτικαί, αἱ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκόντων καὶ ἀκόντων γιγνόμεναι, ὡς ἡ θρεπτικὴ καὶ αὐξητικὴ καὶ σπερματικὴ, φυσικαὶ οὖσαι, καὶ ἡ σφυγμικὴ, ζωτικὴ οὖσα. Since, according to Nemes. 15, Panaetius did not regard the φύσις as forming part of the ψυχή, Schindler (39) supposes that he divided the soul in the following way: ψυχικαὶ δυνάμεις: I. καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεις. 1. φωνητικόν. 2. κινητικόν τοῦ σώματος παντός. 3. μεταβητικόν. 4. ἀναπνευστικόν. II. αἰσθησις (*ib.* 40: "Die καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεις mit den vier Vermögen und die αἰσθησις ergeben zusammen sechs. Das ἡγεμονικόν ist wie bei Zenon nicht eigens gezählt"). Against this interpretation three objections may be raised: first, the καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεις has been counted twice, once as such, and again as the sum of its parts, secondly, the mind has no part in this division, and finally, it is by no means certain that in the passage just quoted the μεταβητικόν and the κινητικόν τοῦ σώματος παντός are really regarded as two different faculties of the soul (cf. the note on *ab Aristotele*: Arist. κινητικόν ~ Theodoret. μεταβητικόν). Moreover, Schindler himself (34_s) has inserted τό before κινητικόν, but if we omit this word, the reading τρία (which, it is true, is found only in the cod. Dresd. (saec. XII), and does not occur in the old Latin translations of Nemesius) may quite well be maintained. So we arrive at a *non liquet*, just as Reinhardt (*Poseidon.*, 353/4); see also below the note on *apud Posidonium*. — in *septem* a Sorano: we have no other data concerning Soranus' division of the soul; perhaps we may conclude from the contents of *De anima* (ch. 15 ἡγεμονικόν, ch. 17 the five senses, ch. 27 the σπερματικόν) that he omitted the φωνητικόν. A division into seven parts (viz. the five senses, λογικόν, and γόνιμον) is sometimes found in Philo (*de fuga et invent.* 182; *quis rer. div. heres* 225. 232; *de mut. nom.* 110; *de Abrah.* 29/30; on the other hand, he also often renders the Stoic view, e. g. *leg. alleg.* 1, 11: ψυχῆς γε μὴν τὸ ἔλογον ἑπταμέρες; *de opif. mundi* 117; *de aetern. mundi* 97; *quod det. pot.* 168; *de agric.* 30). — in *octo penes Chrysippum*: this division is usually attributed to the Stoics in general, e. g. Aët. 4, 4, 4: οἱ Στωικοὶ ἐξ ὀκτώ μερῶν φασὶ συνεστάναι, πέντε μὲν τῶν αἰσθητικῶν ὁρατικοῦ ἀκουστικοῦ ὀσφραντικοῦ γευστικοῦ ἀπτικοῦ, ἕκτου δὲ φωνητικοῦ, ἑβδόμου δὲ σπερματικοῦ, ὀγδόου δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ; for more details, see *St. V F.* 1, 143 *seqq.*; 2, 827/33; Varro *l. l.* 9, 30 (with the note by Goetz-Schoell); L. Stein, *Die Psychologie der Stoa*, 1, 122₂₂₂. — in *novem penes Apollonphanen*: A. was a pupil of Aristo of Chios (Athen. 7, 281 D = *St. V F.* 1, frag. 408); about his psychology no other details are known. — in *duodecim apud quosdam Stoicorum*: *duodecim*

(A Bmg) is certainly the correct reading. Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 206) defends *decem* (B) by referring to [Galen] *hist. philos.* 24 (*ib.* 615, 3/4): Στωικοὶ δὲ τέσσαρα μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς εἶναι φασὶ λογικὸν αἰσθητικὸν φωνητικὸν σπερματικὸν, and by supposing that Tert. should have added these four parts to the six parts into which the soul had been divided by Panaetius. Justus Lipsius (*Physiol. Stoic.*, 3, 17) arrives at the same conclusion by adding the θρεπτικὸν and the κινητικὸν to the eight parts postulated by Zeno and Chrysippus. Schmekel, too, (261₂) retains the reading of B without giving any reason for his view. Perhaps *St. V. F.* 2, 826 may be referred to: τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν ἐν ταῦτῳ φαντασίαν, συγκατάθεσιν, ὀρμῇ, λόγον συνείληφε; by adding these four subdivisions of the ἡγεμονικὸν to the eight parts commonly mentioned we arrive at a total of twelve. Of course, in that case the ἡγεμονικὸν is counted twice (see the note on *in sex a Panaetio*), but perhaps it may be pointed out that in the second part of the sentence (from *sed et on*) Tert. (or rather Soranus or Aenesidemus) wants to mention particularly high numbers, and that for this reason in the case of Posidonius the ἡγεμονικὸν and the λογικὸν have been included as two different faculties of the soul. — *et in duas . . . prosecuit*: here, too, the reading given by A should be retained: “and into two more parts by Pos. <= 14>, who <, however,> when starting from two different notions (ἡγ. and λογ.), goes further still (*exinde*), and <even> divides the soul into seventeen parts” (similarly, Schindler, 60). Instead of *decem septem* Pam. gives *duodecim*, which Diels (*op. cit.*, 206) defends again by referring to [Galen] *hist. philos.* 24 (615, 6/10): Μνήσαρχος δὲ τὴν Στωικῶν ὑπόληψιν ἐπικρίνων τὸ φωνητικὸν <καὶ> τὸ σπερματικὸν περιεῖλεν οἰηθεὶς τῆς αἰσθητικῆς δυνάμεως ταῦτα μετέχειν, μέρη δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ᾗθη μόνον τὸ λογικὸν καὶ τὸ αἰσθητικὸν, ᾧ καὶ μᾶλλον ἂν τις συγχωρήσειεν εὐλόγως. On this passage he remarks: “iamne apparet quomodo in ridiculum sit errorem ductus Tertullianus? nempe Posidonius sex Panaetii partes amplexus generaliter addidit τὸ αἰσθητικὸν καὶ τὸ λογικὸν ἢ ἡγεμονικὸν quos titulos cum senis illis singulos inesse crederet ad ingentem numerum pervenit. hinc altera pullulavit illius stribligo quasi ullo modo λογικὸν et ἡγεμονικὸν distaret”. This solution is very improbable, because in this case (if I understand the meaning of Diels’ words in the right way) Tert. (or rather Soranus) would have included the five senses twice (Panaet. ἡγεμ. and 5 αἰσθ., to which Posid. should have added the αἰσθητικὸν and the λογικὸν or ἡγεμονικὸν: ἡγ. + 5 senses + λογ. (ἡγ.) + αἰσθ. (5) = 12). The supposition of Lipsius, who adds the θυμικὸν and the ἐπιθυμητικὸν to the ten parts which he had already postulated (see the preceding note), is quite groundless. According to L. Stein (*Die Psychologie der Stoa*, 1, 189), *duas* is not to be added to the preceding number, but refers to “the psychological dualism of Posidonius”; this, too, is far from probable. On the contrary, Lindner’s note is worth mentioning: “Mirum in modum haec computatio editores vexavit et ad conjecturas propulit; sed res in salvo est. Stoici quidam in decem partes (unfortunately he adopts the reading of B) animam dividebant, in duas amplius Posidonius, scil. in ἡγεμονικὸν et λογικὸν

et decem partes = duodecim; exinde in septem partes prosecuit, ut duplex ejus existeret animae constructio. Error editorum is est, quod decem et septem = septendecim interpretabantur". Here it is recognized that Tert. mentions two different classifications (this fact was also overlooked by Reifferscheid, who proposed to read *decem et quattuor* instead of *decem et septem*, and by Reinhardt (*Poseidonios*, 355₁), who inserts <et in quindecim> after *sed et in duodecim*); however, if Lindner were right, we should expect *duodecim et septem* instead of *decem et septem*; moreover, *septem* would ask for an explanation not easy to give. Schmekel, 261₂ retains the reading *duodecim*, but observes: "Welche einzelnen Vermögen nun Tertullian zusammengezählt hat, um die Zahl 12 herauszubekommen, lasse ich dahingestellt, da ich keineswegs versichern möchte, dass auch Posidonius in gleicher Weise gezählt hat". An attempt to explain the reading *decem (et) septem* has only been made by Reinhardt (*Poseidon.*, 355/6) and Schindler (53/61). Both scholars rightly start from the classification of the faculties of the soul occurring in Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 26; by adding to it the subdivision of the θρεπτικὴ δύναμις mentioned *ib.* 23 they arrive at the following scheme (Schindler, 58):

A. ψυχικαὶ δυνάμεις (κατὰ προαίρεσιν)	}	I καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις
		1. φωνητικόν
		2. ἀναπνευστικόν
		3. κινητικόν τοῦ σώματος παντός
		4. μεταβητικόν
		II αἰσθησις
B. φυσικαὶ δυνάμεις (ἀπροαίρετοι)	}	III θρεπτικὴ
		1. ἐλκτικὴ
		2. καθεκτικὴ
		3. ἀλλοιωτικὴ
		4. ἀποκριτικὴ
		IV αὐξητικὴ
		V σπερματικὴ
C. ζωτικὴ δύναμις		VI σφυγμικὴ

To these faculties Reinhardt adds the division mentioned by Nemes. ch. 15:

A. λογικόν	
B. τὸ ἐπιπειθὲς λόγῳ	{ θυμικόν ἐπιθυμητικόν
C. τὸ μὴ πειθόμενον λόγῳ	{ θρεπτικόν σπερματικόν σφυγμικόν (ζωτικόν)

and remarks: "Rechnet man die Kräfte nicht nach der Zahl ihrer Gattungen, sondern nach ihren wesentlichen Arten, so erhält man sechs auf beiden Seiten, erst vom 'Principale' dann vom Logos aus, im ganzen also zwölf. Zählt man die Kräfte einzeln in den beiden Reihen durch und streicht das beiden Gemeinsame, so werden es siebzehn". Against this we must raise the objection that a number of twelve powers of the soul (at which Reinhardt arrives by considering the *θρεπτική* and the *αύξητική δύναμις* (Nemes. 26) as identical (353₁) and by tacitly adding the *ἡγεμονικόν*) is not mentioned by Tert. in connection with Posidonius; since, moreover, the classification occurring in Nemes., ch. 15, probably has nothing to do with this philosopher (see Schindler 55/6), it is evident that Reinhardt's explanation, too, is unacceptable. On the contrary, everything is to be said for the interpretation by Schindler, who combines the first-mentioned list (Nemes. 26), where we find fourteen *δυνάμεις* indeed, with Plato's division (*λογικόν-θυμικόν-ἐπιθυμητικόν*), which, as Galen (V, 635 Kühn) informs us, had also been postulated by Posidonius. To his confutation of Reinhardt's attempt to identify the *θρεπτική* with the *αύξητική δύναμις* (54/5) we may add a new argument from the fact that Nemesius in writing *ἡ θρεπτική καὶ αύξητική καὶ σπερματική, φυσικαὶ οὔσαι* enumerates the three functions of the *θρεπτικόν* as described by Aristotle (cf. e. g. *de anim.* 2, 4 (415a 25/6): *ἥς (sc. τῆς θρεπτικῆς ψυχῆς) ἐστὶν ἔργα γεννησάαι (Nem. σπερματική) καὶ τροφῆν χρῆσθαι* (Nem. *θρεπτική*) ~ 415b 26/7: *οὐδὲν γὰρ φθίνει οὐδ' αὖξεταί* (Nem. *αύξητική*) *φυσικῶς μὴ τρεφόμενον*), so that there is not the slightest reason to connect two of these three terms more closely with each other. Nevertheless, there remains one serious difficulty, viz., the fact that in the former list the *ἡγεμονικόν* is not mentioned, whilst in the latter the *λογικόν* is included. With regard to this difficulty Schindler (p. 60) remarks: "Das *ἡγεμονικόν* zählt er (viz. Tert.) — was häufig bei diesen Philosophen (viz. Zeno, Panaetius, Posidonius) — nicht eigens"; but, firstly, we have already seen that the omission of the *ἡγεμονικόν* by Zeno and Panaetius is very questionable, and secondly, Tert. mentions the *ἡγεμονικόν* as well as the *λογικόν*. So it seems necessary to include the *ἡγεμονικόν* in the first-mentioned list. In doing so we arrive at a number of fifteen *δυνάμεις*; but probably the *κινήτικόν τοῦ σώματος παντός* and the *μεταβητικόν* may be regarded as one and the same faculty (see the note on *in sex a Panaetio*; cf. also the title occurring in Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 3, 64: *Περὶ τῆς μεταβατικῆς κινήσεως*). — For the form *decem septem* (Δ), frequently used by Livy (Priscian. *Gramm. Lat.* III: 286, 23), see Landgraf's note on Cic. *Rosc. Amerin.* 20; Kühnast, *Liv. Synt.*, 37; Svénn, *Pallad.*, 289/90. — The variation of *penes* and *apud* is rather common in Tert.'s writings, e. g. *apol.* 46, 17: *penes nos . . . apud vos* (F E; *apud vos* om. Vulg.); *c. Chr.* 4, 50/1: *apud illam . . . penes Marcionem*; *test. anim.* 4 (139, 7): *penes inferos . . . ib. l. 9/10: apud inferos* (an. 58, l. 8: *p. i.*, 58, 3. 5: *a. i.*); cf. also Waltz., *Ét.*, 475₅, and for other authors, Thes. l. L. II: 344, 61 seq.; Sörbom, 47 (Tac.). For the use of *penes* instead of *apud* in

general, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 499. 502; Gerlo, 2, 38; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 127; Friebel, 34; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 37; Parriger, 121. — **aliae ex aliis species**: the reading of B, *in alias*, is wrong, personifications being extremely frequent in Tert. (see the materials collected by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 36/42). **species** of course is the translation of εἶδος, cf. e. g. Nemes. 15: διαιροῦσιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως εἰς δυνάμεις ἢ εἶδη ἢ μέρη τὴν ψυχὴν. For more details, see A. Leissner, *Die platon. Lehre von den Seelenteilen* (thes. Munich 1909), 60. — **principale** = ἡγεμονικόν (since Sen. *ep.* 92, 1); see the note on 15, 1.

3. **Huiusmodi**: the genit. of quality has become equivalent to a subst.; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 106 and the literature quoted by Engelbrecht, *Ztschr. f. d. österr. Gymn.* 41 (1890), 485. — **efficaciae** = ἐνεργεῖαι, cf. *Gloss.* II Philox. E F 8: *efficacia ἐνέργεια*, ἄνουςις, σπουδὴ and Rufin.-Orig. in *Rom.* 8, 2: *aliud est possibilitatem esse in aliquo, aliud efficaciam vel efficientiam, quod Graeci δύνανιν et ἐνεργεῖαν vocant.* The plural, which is very rare, is used by Christian authors only (Thes. I. L. V, 2: 157, 58/60). — **Aristoteles**: as is generally known, Aristotle blames Plato's division of the soul into μέρη and prefers to speak of δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς (*de anim.* 1, 5, especially 411b 5/10, and 2, 2/4; cf. also *de iuv. et sen.* 1 = 467b 16/8). This question certainly occurred in doxographical literature (however, Aëtius does not mention it; cf. Introduction, p. 40*), as is shown by such passages as Galen *de dogm. Hippocr. et Plat.* 6, 2: ὁ δὲ Ἀ. τε καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος εἶδη μὲν ἢ μέρη ψυχῆς οὐκ ὀνομάζουσιν, δυνάμεις δὲ εἶναι φασιν μιᾶς οὐσίας ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ὀρμωμένης; Stob. *ecl.* I, p. 351 Wachsm.: διὸ τὰ μὲν μέρη παρηγεῖτο Ἀ. ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, τὰς δὲ δυνάμεις οὐκέτι; Alex. Aphrodis. *de anima* f. 128^v; Chalcid. *comm.* 223 (he is discussing the psychology of the Peripatetics): *dividitur* (sc. anima) *tamen alio quodam genere, sic ut ex eadem divisione non magis partes eius ullae quam potentiae et virtutes considerentur.* Cf. E. Güthling, *Die Lehre des Ar. von den Seelenteilen* (Liegnitz 1882); for Posidonius, see Schmekel, 259; Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrb. N. F.*, Suppl. 24, 580; Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 62/4; Schindler, 27/9. Afterwards the same view was held by Severus the Platonist (Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 13, 17, 6) and by Porphyrius, who devoted a special treatise to it (περὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων; see Stob. *ecl.* I: 350, 10 *seqq.* Wachsm.); cf. also Plutarch's monograph *Εἰ μὲρὸς τὸ παθητικὸν τῆς ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆς ἢ δύναμις* (706 *seqq.* Wytténbach). — **motorium**: τὸ κινητικὸν <κατὰ τόπον>; the word is not used as a subst. before Tert. — **actorium**: ἄ. λ. It is not clear what Greek term this word is meant to translate (πρακτικόν? at any rate not ποιητικόν, cf. Arist. *de anim.* 430a 12, etc.); perhaps it was only meant to form the counterpart of *cogitatorium*. — **cogitatorium** (= τὸ διανοητικόν), too, is a neologism. Here the word denotes an *ingenium animae*; a different sense is found in *spect.* 2 (4, 1/2): (neque) *spiritus ideo insitus corpori, ut insidiarum, ut fraudium, ut iniquitatum cogitatorium fieret* and *res.* 15 (44, 22 *seqq.*): *sed etsi in cerebro . . . principalitas sensuum consecrata est . . . caro erit omne animae cogitatorium*, where it means the seat of the mind in the body (see Esser, 116₇).

Tert. has certainly been copied by Hier., *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 13: *circa animae regionem, ubi cogitatorium, ubi intellectuale consistit.* — **ipsi**... **sensus**: similarly, Arnob. 7, 4: *notisque illis sensibus... quinque*, and Aug. *de lib. arb.* 2, 3, 8: *illos vulgatissimos corporis sensus; ib.: ab istis quinque notissimis.* — **ad animae sectiones pertinebit**: this expression is not quite in accordance with logic, as we should either expect “will lead to a division of the soul” (*sectio* in the singular, cf. Gell. 20, 1, 39: *sectione partitioneque corporis*) or “will lead to the assumption of separate parts of the soul”. Nor is the use of *quando* quite logical: the argument is once more abridged (its complete form would be: “quando anima hoc modo in membra dividi non possit; atquin ne ipsum quidem corpus ita in membra dividi potest”).

4. While mentioning the body, Tert. has come to consider such scriptural texts as 1 Cor. 12, 12: *καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶ καὶ μέλη πολλά ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλά ὄντα ἓν ἐστὶ σῶμα* (for similar passages, see Lietzmann's note, *Hdb. N. T.* 9, p. 62 and Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 37, 5, *ib.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 109). This consideration renders the supposition that the soul might be divided into separate parts still more improbable; so Tert. now dares to speak of a *divisio*, whereas in § 3 he was more cautious and only mentioned a *distributio animae*. — **Archimedis**: the inventor was Ctesibius (see Orinsky, R. E. XI, 2074/6), whereas Archimedes brought the instrument to perfection. — **munificentiam** has the concrete meaning ‘gift’, just as *indulgentia* in *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (520, 22/3): *et non erit iam depretiator operum et indulgentiarum creatoris*; *adv. Val.* 29 (205, 8); *Apul. de mundo* 25 (161, 8 Thom.); for this use of *munificentia* we may perhaps refer to Tac. *ann.* 13, 18, 2: *at matris ira nulla munificentia leniri* and Arnob. 1, 29: *variarum munificentia voluptatum*. For the similar use of *liberalitas* (which is much more frequent), see the note on 47,2. — **organum hydraulicum dico**: cf. the note on 28, 2 *Samius sophista... ille Pythagoras*. In *de bapt.* 8, 1 Tert. compares the human body to an organ, which through baptism obtains the *sublimitas spiritalis* by the *manus impositio*: *sane humano ingenio licebit spiritum in aquam arcessere et concorporationem eorum accommodatis desuper manibus alio spiritu tantae claritatis animare: deo autem in suo organo non licebit per manus sanctas sublimitatem modulari spiritalem?* The same image is used by Gregor. Nyss. *de anim. et resurr.* 36 A *seqq.* with regard to the relation between body and soul (see Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 234); cf. also the same author, *de opif. hom.* 12 (P. G. 44, 161 A/B; the comparison of the body to an organ in Clem. Alex. *paedag.* 2, 4, 41, 5 has a different meaning). Though Posidonius may have had a special liking for this image, as is supposed by Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 238₁ (at all events it is remarkable that another invention of Archimedes, viz. his planetarium, is mentioned in the ‘dogmatic’ *argumentum ex creatione* for the existence of God as recorded by Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 9, 115), a more plausible supposition seems to be that, like the comparison to a puppet (for which see the note on 6, 3), it too was borrowed from popular philosophy, in which Stoic conceptions

played a prominent part (Esser, 113 refers to the polyp image used by the Stoics, which, however, is slightly different). For the hydraulic organ, see Sudhaus, *Aetna*, 144/7; Tittel, art. 'Hydraulis', R. E. IX, 60 *seqq.*; K. von Jan, art. 'Flöten (Orgel)' in: Baumeister, *Denkmäler d. klass. Altert.*, 563/9. — **compendia sonorum**: according to Thes. I. L. III: 2039, 77 *seq.*, *compendium* here means 'potestas, facultas, auxilium, adiutorium'. As other instances of this meaning the author of the article quotes Apul. *de mundo* 27: *non eiusmodi compendio machinatores fabricarum astutia unius conversionis multa et varia pariter administrant?* and *ad nat.* 2, 12, 4, but there the usual sense may quite well be retained. Here the choice of the word is mainly due to parallelism (≈ *itinerarum*), so that it may be paraphrased by *itinerarum brevi(or)a*. — **spiritus.... anhelat**: cf. Sen. *nat. quaest.* 2, 6, 5: *cornua et tubae* (sc. in organo) *et quae aquarum pressura . . . sonitum formant*; *Aetna* 299: *quae* (sc. ars regentis) *tenuem impellens animam subremigat unda* (here, however, the water is represented as the moving force; see Sudhaus' note). — **administratur**: 'is used'; *a.* very frequently means *agere, curare, exercere* in Tert. (cf. e. g. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 4; from *de anim.* we may add 39, 1 and 57, 9). — For the antithesis **substantia . . . opera** ('function'), see the note on 11, 1. The whole discussion may also be compared with Method. *de autexu.* 5, 2: οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔχοντα διάφορα μέλη κατακερματίζομεν εἰς πολλὰ γενητά· ἄλλ' . . . ἐν τι γενητὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον πολυμερὲς πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι φαμέν.

5. **exemplum est**: the omission of *est* in A is no more than a clerical error (see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 45₃). — **a Stratone et Aenesidemo et Heraclito**: this passage has been discussed in detail by Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 209/12 (cf. also Witt, *Albinus*, 137), who first of all refers to Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 349/50: οἱ μὲν μὴδὲν φασιν εἶναι αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν διάνοιαν) παρὰ τὸ πῶς ἔχον σώμα καθάπερ ὁ Δικαίαρχος, οἱ δὲ εἶναι μὲν ἔλκεαν, οὐκ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ τόπῳ περιέχεσθαι, ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, ὡς Αἰνησιδήμος κατὰ Ἡράκλειτον (≈ 15, 5: *ut neque extrinsecus agitari putes principale istud secundum Heraclitum*) . . . καὶ οἱ μὲν διαφέρειν αὐτὴν τῶν αἰσθήσεων, ὡς οἱ πλείους, οἱ δὲ αὐτὴν εἶναι τὰς αἰσθήσεις, καθάπερ διὰ τινων ὁπῶν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων προκύπτουσιν, ἥς στάσεως ἤρξε Στράτων τε ὁ φυσικός καὶ Αἰνησιδήμος, and for Heraclitus to *ib.* 7, 130: ἐν δὲ ἐγρηγοροσὶ πάλιν διὰ τῶν αἰσθητικῶν πόρων ὥσπερ διὰ τινων θυρίδων προκύψας (sc. ὁ λόγος) καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι συμβαλὼν λογικὴν ἐνδύεται δύναμιν. According to Diels' supposition (which is a highly probable one), Sextus as well as Soranus consulted Aenesidemus (the latter through the intermediary of a physician who was an adherent of the Sceptics), both authors making the same mistake by attributing a view to this philosopher which he had only recorded (for this question, see Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. Griech. Skept.*, 234/5, and the note on 9,5). For Heraclitus, cf. frag. 67a: *sic <ut> aranea . . . stans in medio telae sentit, quam cito musca aliquem filum suum corrumpit itaque illuc celeriter currit quasi de fili perfectione dolens, sic hominis anima aliqua parte corporis laesa illuc festine meat quasi impatiens*

laesionis corporis, cui firme et proportionaliter iuncta est, and O. Gigon, *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit* (Leipsic 1935), 113/4; *Der Ursprung der Gr. Philos.* (Basel 1945), 229/37; M. Pohlenz, *B Ph W* 23 (1903), 972. For Strato, cf. *Aët.* 4, 23, 3: Σ. καὶ τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐν τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πεπονθόσι τόποις συνίστασθαι, and [Plut.] *de lib. et aegrit.* 4. Diels also compares (210₁) Philo frag. p. 615 Mangey: ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμοποιίας. αἱ αἰσθήσεις θυρίσιν εἰκόασιν· διὰ γὰρ τούτων ὥσανει θυρίδων ἐπεισέρχεται τῷ νῷ ἡ κατάληψις τῶν αἰσθητῶν, καὶ πάλιν ὁ νοῦς ἐκκύπτει διὰ αὐτῶν (cf. *rer. divin. heres* 111; *de somn.* 1, 42; *de Abrah.* 72); we may also refer to the statement by the Stoic in Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 20, 46: *ut facile intellegi possit animum et videre et audire, non eas partis quae quasi fenestrae sint animi, quibus tamen sentire nihil queat mens, nisi id agat et adsit*. For more details, see Heinze's note on Lucr. 3, 350/8 (p. 99/101) and 360 (103/4; Lucr. contests this view, cf. 3, 359/61: *dicere porro oculos nullam rem cernere posse, / sed per eos animum ut foribus spectare reclusis, / desiperest*). The comparison of the senses (especially the eyes) to doors or windows is extremely frequent in popular philosophy; cf. e. g. Varro *sat. Menipp.* 290 Bücheler: *sensus portae, venae hydragogiae, clovaca intestini*; Pohlenz's note on Cic., *loc. cit.*; Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 167₁; M. Apelt, *De rationibus . . . quae Philoni cum Posidonio intercedunt* (comm. philol. Jenens. VIII, fasc. 1), 112 and 115. The Christian authors used to connect this conception with Jerem. 9, 21: *quia ascendit mors per fenestras nostras*, e. g. Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 2, 8; in *Abd.* 10/1; Basil. *Anc.* 15, p. 701 B; Eucher. *form.* 9 (56, 11/2 Wotke; Eucherius also refers to Cant. 2, 9); Method. *de cibis* 13, 4; Orig. *comm. in Thren.* 2, 9 (257, 26/7 Klosterm.); Rufin.-Orig. in *Cantic.* 4 (183 C); Ruric. *ep.* 1, 18 (371, 2); Gregor. Magn. *moral.* 15, 52; 21, 2; Cyrill. Alex. *Glaphyr. in Exod. lib.* 2 (P. G. 69, 428 A); Caesar. Arelat. *serm.* 155, 1 Morin; Aug. *confess.* 10, 10, 17 and *de gen. ad litt.* 12, 20, 43; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 52 (345 A/B). For the conception of the senses as door-keepers, see Gronau, *op. cit.*, 174; Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 21; Lang, *Das Traumbuch des Synesius*, 56/7. — *ipsa* again emphasizes the identity of the soul (cf. 10, 9). — *velut flatus in calamo*: as far as I know, this metaphor is employed nowhere else in connection with the relation between body and soul; on the other hand, it occurs rather frequently with regard to the inspiration of prophets by the divine spirit (see the passages from Philo, Plutarch, and Athenagoras collected by Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 180). A kind of parallel to this passage is furnished by Prudent. *Apoth.* 843 seqq.: *adde et distinctum quem musica tibia flatum / concipit . . . haec cum te videas mortali in corpore posse, / cur non aeternum potuisse infundere credas, / qualem animam voluit? — per sensualia (Tp) . . . emicet*: Sextus: καθάπερ διὰ τινων ὁπῶν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων προκύπτουσιν. — *ex se divisionibus*: ∞ § 1: *divisibilis ex se*. Soranus had a special liking for exact classifications, cf. e. g. *gyn.* 1, 1, 1; 1, 2, 1/2. — *detineantur*: “by which subdivisions they are held” = “which subdivisions apply to them” (*deriventur* (B Gel.) makes no sense whatever). Of course Tert. is thinking of such detailed divisions as had been made by Posidonius

(see the comm. on § 2). — *metationibus sequestrentur* refers to § 3: *Quibus . . . determinaverunt. Metatio* in this passage is equivalent to *domicilium* or *hospitium* (likewise, *pall.* 2, 2; cf. also *adv. Val.* 23 (200, 11/2): *inferius illum metatur medietatem Achamoth*). *metari* = *habitare* frequently occurs in Paulin. Nol. (see R. C. Golschmidt, *Paulinus' Churches at Nola* (Amsterdam 1940), 138). Cf. the similar use of *inquilinus* in 38, 4. — *sequestrentur* = *seponantur* (similarly, *res.* 27 (65, 4); 38 (80, 20); *adv. Val.* 25 (201, 18); the *ἀ. λ. sequestratorium* occurs in *res.* 52 (109, 17); for more details, see Mossberg, 91 and Goelz., *Avit.*, 487/8. — *medici*: it stands to reason that this word refers to Soranus in the first place (see the preface to this chapter and to ch 51).

15. *ἡ ἡγεμονικόν.*

“The importance of the *ἡγεμονικόν* is proved by the fact that whoever denies its existence, first denies the existence of the soul itself (§ 1). It is in this way that Dicaearchus and Andreas and Asclepiades the physicians neutralize the *ἡγεμονικόν*: they make the senses <, which they regard as identical with the soul,> take the place of the mind <i. e. the *ἡγεμονικόν*>, and so ascribe the *ἡγεμονικόν* to the senses <; thus they neutralize the soul, and with it the *ἡγεμονικόν*>. Moreover, Asclepiades in this context refers to the fact that several animals live on for a certain time after the removal of such parts of their bodies as have been supposed to contain the *ἡγεμονικόν* (§ 2). On the other hand, many physicians and philosophers assume the existence of this faculty of the soul, and so do we Christians, who are more numerous than they all, and who on this question, as on all things, have received the truth from God (§ 3). In fact, many scriptural texts show that the mind and the vital power have their seats in the heart (§ 4); this is sufficient to render the various theories of the philosophers on this subject superfluous (§ 5). Many physicians, too, regard the heart as the seat of the *ἡγεμονικόν*, so that Asclepiades stands refuted by his own colleagues (§ 5)”.

For the interpretation of this chapter we have very rich materials at our disposal, which enable us to show with absolute certainty that Tert. has borrowed all doxographical data from Soranus. In the first place, we may quote a passage from the *Onomasticon* of Pollux (2, 226; adduced by Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 207) which has been copied from Soranus' etymological treatise (for which see the Introduction, p. 27*): καὶ ὁ μὲν νοῦς καὶ λογισμὸς καὶ ἡγεμονικόν, εἴτε περὶ ἐγκεφάλῳ κατὰ Πυθαγόραν καὶ Πλάτωνα ἰδρυμένον, εἴτ' ἐν παρεγκεφαλίδι ἢ μήνιγγιν ὡς πολλοῖς τῶν ἱατρῶν δοκεῖ, εἴτε κατὰ τὸ μεσόφρυον ὡς ἔλεγε Στράτων, εἴτε περὶ τὸ αἶμα ὡς Ἐμπεδοκλῆς τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, εἴτε περὶ τὴν καρδίαν ὡς ἡ Στοά. Our second source is the detailed discussion of the *ἡγεμονικόν* by Caelius Aurelianus, *acut. morb.* 1, 8, 53/4, a passage which may be regarded as a text translated from Soranus (its importance was pointed out for the first time by Wellmann, *Hermes* 36 (1901), 143). In dealing with the question

which part of the body is to be regarded as the seat of phrenitis, Caelius says: *aliqui igitur cerebrum pati dixerunt* (viz. Hippocrates), *alii eius fundum sive basin quam nos sessionem dicere poterimus* (Herophilus), *alii membranas* (Erasistratus and his pupil Strato), *alii cerebrum et eius membranas, alii cor* (e. g. Praxagoras), *alii cordis summitatem, alii membranam, quae cor circumtegit, alii arteriarum eam quam Graeci ἄορτην appellant, alii venam crassam quam iidem φλέβα παχείαν vocaverunt, alii diaphragma* (Diocles), *et quid ultra tendimus quod facile explicare possumus, si id quod senserunt dixerimus? nam singuli eum locum in phreniticis pati dixerunt, in quo a n i m a e r e g i m e n esse suspicati sunt. denique singulorum iudicium atque assertionem pertractantes expugnabimus libris quos de passionum causis scribemus.* Wellmann rightly takes the last sentence to refer to the Αἰτιολογούμενα (for which see the Introduction, p. 28*), in which Soranus must have combated all divergent views about this subject in his usual way (cf. 6, 6; *cum omnibus philosophorum sententiis expertus*). Thirdly, numerous parallels may be adduced from the aetiological part of the so-called *Anonymus Darembergi sive Fuchsii* (see the Introduction, p. 28*). Though the author of this treatise has not yet been ascertained, we may follow Diels and Kind in regarding the δόξαι which it contains as borrowed from Soranus. The following passages are worth mentioning: *Hippocrates*: P 21 v 7/13 (p. 70 Fuchs): ὁ δὲ Ἰ. τὸν μὲν νοῦν φησιν ἐν τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ τετάχθαι καθάπερ τι ἱερὸν ἄγαλμα ἐν ἀκροπόλει τοῦ σώματος (in a discussion of phrenitis); *ib.* 151 v 6 *seqq.* (p. 77; epilepsy); P 25 v 1/5 (p. 80; also for Erasistratus; apoplexy). *Diocles*: P 21 v 5/6 (p. 70; phrenitis): εἶοικε γὰρ καὶ οὗτος τὴν φρόνησιν περὶ ταύτην (sc. τὴν καρδίαν) ἀπολείπειν; 151 r 14/v 3 (p. 77; epilepsy); P 26 v 13/5 (p. 82; headache): τὸν ἡγεμόνα τοῦ σώματος . . . τὴν καρδίαν, ἀφ' ἧς τὸ ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ σώματος ὥρμηται κατ' αὐτόν; *Praxagoras*: P 21 r 22/v 1 (p. 70; phrenitis): Πραξαγόρας δὲ φλεγμονὴν τῆς καρδίας εἶναι φησι τὴν φρενίτιν, ἧς καὶ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἔργον φρόνησιν οἶεται εἶναι; 151 r 11/2 (p. 76): according to Praxagoras, epilepsy is caused by an obstruction of the δίοδος τοῦ ἀπὸ καρδίας ψυχικοῦ πνεύματος. Finally, I adduce the relevant part of the discussion of lethargy (P 23 v 15/24 r 2, pp. 73/4): Ἐρασίστρατος μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον αὐτοῦ φησι γίνεσθαι τὸν λήθαργον κατὰ τι πάθος τῶν περὶ τὴν μ ἡ ν ι γ γ α ψυχικῶν δυνάμεων, ἐφ' ὧν δὴ γίνεσθαι τὸν λήθαργον. Διοκλῆς δὲ τοῦ περὶ τὴν κ α ρ δ ί α ν καὶ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ψυχικοῦ πνεύματος κατὰψυξιν ἡγεῖται εἶναι καὶ τοῦ ταύτῃ συνοῖκου αἵματος πῆξιν. Ὁ δὲ Ἱπποκράτης φησὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ καὶ ὑγροῦ γίνεσθαι χυμοῦ τὸν λήθαργον. ἔστι δὲ οὗτος τὸ φλέγμα, ὅφ' οὗ δὴ βαρούμενον τὸν ἐγκέφαλον μὴκέτι δύνασθαι τὴν ψυχικὴν δύναμιν εἰς ἕκαστον μέρος τοῦ σώματος ἐπιπέμπειν καὶ οὕτω τὰς καταφορὰς γίνεσθαι.

The treatise *Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* seems to have contained the most detailed discussion of this subject; since, however, this exposition was repeated in Soranus' principal work, *Περὶ ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν*, and in his *Αἰτιολογούμενα*, it may be assumed that in *Περὶ ψυχῆς* a special chapter was devoted to it; at all events, this is more probable than the supposition that Tert.

should have consulted the etymological treatise as well (see for this question the Introduction, p. 28*). With the exception of § 4, we may consider the entire contents of this chapter to have been borrowed from Soranus. As to the δόξαι of the philosophers and physicians this is obvious at once; the same may be said with regard to the *versus Orphei vel Empedoclis* (§ 5), for in Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν Soranus quoted verses of both authors (see Kind, R. E. 2 R., III, 1118 and Voigt's monograph, p. 43). Remains the quotation of the *Aegyptii*, which must refer to *Mercurius Aegyptius*. Since the *Corpus Hermeticum* is quoted three times in *de anima* (2, 3; 28, 1; 33, 2), probably through the intermediary of Albinus, we may suppose that here too Tert. follows this author, though it is also possible that this quotation was added by Tert. himself (see the Introduction, p. 47*).

It is evident that the *argumentum ex scriptura sacra* in § 4 is Tert.'s own idea. Perhaps he wanted to create a counterpart to the famous discussion of the ἡγεμονικόν by Chrysippus, who in this context adduced a great number of passages from Homer (see the comm. on § 4); Soranus may have given a rather circumstantial account of the Stoic view, which, as often, was congenial to him. On the other hand, arguments taken from Holy Scripture are so frequent in *de anima*, that this supposition is not necessary.

The varying answers given to the question where the ἡγεμονικόν is to be localized were regarded by the Sceptics as a classical example of the διαφωνία τῶν δογματικῶν, as is shown by Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 7, 313: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν τόπον ὁ νοῦς τὸν ἐν ᾧ ἔστι συγκαταλαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ, ἐχρῆν μὴ διαφωνεῖσθαι τοῦτον παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις, τῶν μὲν κεφαλὴν λεγόντων εἶναι τῶν δὲ θώρακα, καὶ ἐπ' εἰδους τῶν μὲν ἐγκέφαλον τῶν δὲ μήνιγγα, τινῶν δὲ καρδίαν, ἄλλων δὲ ἥπατος πύλας ἢ τι τοιοῦτο μέρος τοῦ σώματος. Clemens Alexandrinus also mentions this problem as a typical instance of a question at issue (*strom.* 8, 4, 14, 4). Finally, we may refer to the Δικτυακά by Dionysius of Aegae, in which fifty medical theses are both defended and refuted in the manner of the famous Δισσοὶ λόγοι. According to the excerpt preserved by Photius (Deichgräber, *Empirikerschule*, p. 340, 3/4), the title of the forty-ninth was: ὅτι οὐ περὶ καρδίαν τὸ διανοητικόν, ἀλλὰ περὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ ὅτι ἀνάπαλιν.

1. an: the connection with the last sentence of the preceding chapter is very close again (see 5, 1). For the use of *an* instead of *num* in indirect questions, which is very frequent in Tert., see Hofm., *Synt.*, 696; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 128/9; Chruzander, 75. — *gradus*: similarly, Aug. *civ. dei* 7, 23: *Varro . . . tres esse adfirmat animae gradus in omni universaque natura . . . Tertium gradum animae esse summum qui vocatur animus*. The adjunct. *sapientialis* is found in Tert. only. — *quod ἡγεμονικόν appellat*: as ἡγεμονικόν is a typically Stoic term, it is avoided by Plotinus, who says ἡγεμονοῦν or ἡγούμενον instead (2, 3, 17; 3, 1, 4; 4, 4, 40; 4, 7, 6, 7); see Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes*, 82, and for the use of this word by Christian authors, Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 18, 12 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 73/4). As to the attraction

of the gender of the relative pronoun by the nominal predicate, see Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 38/9; it is particularly frequent in cases where the nominal predicate is a Greek word, as in this place, e. g. Cic. *nat. deor.* 3, 28: *iste quasi consensus quam συμπάθειαν Graeci vocant* (from Tert. cf. 21, 6: *liberam arbitrii potestatem quod ἀντεξούσιον dicitur* and *res.* 15 (44, 24/5); *principalitas sensuum . . . quod ἡγεμονικόν appellatur*). Another instance is found in 39, 3: *genii . . . quod daemonum nomen est*. — **principale**: Cic. (*nat. deor.* 2, 29; *Tusc.* 1, 20) gives *principatus* as a translation, as does Gell. 10, 10, 2: *cum principatu cordis* (in Tert. this word has a different meaning; see the note on 23, 2). *Principale* = ἡ γ. is found from Sen. (*ep.* 92, 1; 113, 23; 121, 10; *de ira* 1, 3, 7) downwards; it is particularly frequent in Hier., probably in imitation of Tert. — **periclitatur**: -etur (A) is a slip of the pen due to the preceding *negetur*.

2. **aliqui**: for the use of *aliqui(s)* before, or after, proper names, which is a peculiarity of Tert., see Thes. 1. L. I: 1612, 12 *seqq.*, Hoppe, *Synt.*, 105, and Waltz., *comm.*, 92, for *aliqui* instead of *aliquis*, Hoppe, *op. cit.*, 105₁. — **Dicaearchus**: Aët. *plac.* 4, 2, 7: Δ. (τὴν ψυχὴν) ἁρμονίαν τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων; Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 349: οἱ μὲν μηδὲν φασιν εἶναι αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν διάνοιαν) παρὰ τὸ πῶς ἔχον σῶμα, καθάπερ ὁ Δ.; Cic. *Acad.* 2, 39, 124: *denique, sitne* (sc. animus) *an, ut Dicaearcho visum est, ne sit quidem ullus?*; *Tusc.* 1, 10, 21; 1, 18, 41; 1, 22, 51; Atticus quoted by Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 15, 9 (810 A): ἀνῆρχε τὴν ὅλην ὑπόστασιν τῆς ψυχῆς. — **Andreas** either refers to the father of Asclepiades or to the pupil of Herophilus and court-physician of Ptolemaeus IV, who in 217 b. Chr. was killed in the battle of Raphia (Polyb. 5, 81, 6; cf. Wellmann, *R. E.* I, 2136/7 and Susemihl, 1, 817; Heraclides of Tarent, an adherent of the empirical school of physicians, qualified him as a quack: see Deichgräber, *Die griech. Empirikerschule*, frag. 10b (p. 69, 16) and 202 (p. 187, 26 *seqq.*); *ib.*, p. 299). As the name is mentioned nowhere else in this context, it is not possible to state whom Soranus meant here. The former possibility seems more probable, because the name of Andreas is combined with that of Asclepiades; on the other hand, the latter physician is mentioned twice by Soranus (Cael. Aurelian. *acut. morb.* 3, 12, 108; 3, 11, 98). We would be inclined to assume a mistake of Tert. (*Andreas et Asclepiades* instead of ὁ τοῦ Ἀνδρέου A.; in § 6 he wrongly mentions Protagoras instead of Praxagoras), were it not that Soranus, when quoting physicians and philosophers, never adds the names of their fathers. — **Asclepiades**: Aët. 4, 2, 8: ὁ ἱατρὸς συγγυμνασίαν τῶν αἰσθήσεων (sc. τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεφύνατο); Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 202: Ὁ τὸν ἱατρὸν . . . ἀναιροῦντα . . . τὸ ἡγεμονικόν (Soranus seems to have spoken about him in similar terms, as is shown by Tert.'s words *abstulerunt principale*); *ib.* 380; Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 1, 14, 115: (A.) *regnum animae aliqua in parte corporis constitutum negat*; *ib.*, the definition of the soul as *sensuum omnium coetus* (Aët., *loc. cit.*, συγγυμνασία τῶν αἰσθήσεων, which shows that Soranus did keep close to the expressions usual in doxography); [Galen] *hist.*

philos. 24 (*D D G* 613, 8/9). — **dum . . . sensus**: Tert. means to say that by declaring the soul to be identical with the senses Dicaearchus, etc. neutralize its existence; in doing so (*ita*), they neutralize the ἡγεμονικόν at the same time, for if the soul is 'nothing but the senses', the senses take the place of all its parts, the *animus* (= λογικόν = ἡγεμονικόν) included (*in animo ipso . . . esse sensus*); thus this definition of the soul leads to a denial of the existence of both *anima* and *animus*, which, if identical with the senses, are nothing at all. — **quorum . . . principale**: for the genit. *quorum*, cf. res. 34 (74, 1/2): *cum etiam saecularium principum plena semper indulgentia vindicetur*, and for the use of the genit. instead of the dat. in general, the note on 6, 3. — **vectatur**: an archaism, for which see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 28; cf. the use of ἐπιβατεύω in Hdt. 3, 63, etc. — **illa argumentatione**, which Chalcid. *comm.* 216 attributes to Democritus and Epicurus: *iidem negant animae vim principalem consistere in capite, propterea quod pleraque animalia capite secto vivant ad tempus et agant solita . . . ut apes et item fuci; . . . illud etiam in corde negant; crocodilos enim avulsis cordibus aliquamdiu vivere . . . hoc idem in testudinibus observatum marinis et terrestribus capris*. — **muscae**: Lucian. *encom. musc.* 6: ἀποτμηθεῖσα δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν μυῖα ἐπὶ πολὺ ζῇ τῷ ἄλλῳ σώματι καὶ ἔμπνους ἐστίν. — **lucustae** (A) is the correct reading (also in 32, 3), for which cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 465; Thiele, *Aesop.*, 286/7; Goelz., *Avit.*, 381; Lavar., 25. — **caprae**: Chalcid., *loc. cit.* — **corda**: Galen *de dogm. Hipp. et Plat.* 2, 4: καὶ φαίνεται τὰ ζῶα τῆς καρδίας ἤδη κατὰ τῶν βωμῶν ἐπικειμένης οὐκ ἀναπνέοντα μόνον ἢ κεκραγότα συντόνας, ἀλλὰ καὶ φεύγοντα, μέχρι περ ἂν ὑπὸ τῆς αἰμορραγίας ἀποθάνῃ; for the tortoise, see Arist. *de iuv. et sen.* 2 (468b 15; copied by Apollon. *mirab.* 26). — **quo . . . amisso**: the conjecture by Kroymann is necessary (*quod* A B Gel), because Tert. only omits the subject of the absolute ablat. when the partic. has impersonal sense, e. g. *pud.* 9 (238, 2): *recordatur patris . . . satisfacto redit*; *ib.* 7 (233, 4/5): *moechum vero et fornicatorem quis non mortuum statim admisso* (Reifferscheid supposes *ab admisso*) *pronuntiavit?*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 12 (352, 4/5): *totum hoc iudicato dispositum et ordinatum est*; *apol.* 18, 1; *orat.* 1 (180, 19; A); cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 22. It is evident that such phrases as *quod facto*, *foedus inito*, which are found in Iordanes, etc. (see Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 32/3; A. Erikson, 70), are impossible in Tert.'s works. For the omission of the subject of the absol. ablat. in general, see Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 773; Hofm., *Synt.*, 448; Freund, 19; Horn, 17; Lindgren, 60 *seqq.* Kroymann's conjecture is to be preferred to the reading of B, *quod si fuisset amissus*, because it preserves the isolation of the words *si fuisset* (see the note on 10, 8), which form a necessary premiss of the argument: "a *principale* does not exist, for if it existed, the soul would be destroyed, if this *principale* were lost together with its seat (*quo . . . amisso cum suis sedibus*). <But the loss of no part of the body implies the loss of the soul, so that no part of the body can be the seat of the *principale*; hence this *principale*, which should needs have a seat, does not exist>".

3. This enumeration obviously derives from Soranus, who for that reason is mentioned at the end of it (in 25, 5, where again he is mentioned at the end, the case is different; see the note). For Plato, Empedocles, Strato, and Epicurus, see the note on § 5. — **Democritus**: Aët. 4, 5, 1: Πλάτων Δ. ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ κεφαλῇ (τὸ ἥγ.); Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 5, 22. — **Socrates**: it is not very clear where Tert. got this information. Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 204) supposes that we should read *Xenocrates*, as this philosopher is mentioned in § 5; since, however, in the *Plac. philos.* the name of Xenocrates does not appear in this context, and Tert. in such passages as the present one is often very inaccurate (see the notes on §§ 2 and 6), we had better leave the text unaltered. — **Aristoteles**: e. g. *part. anim.* 3, 3 (665a 12 seqq.); in Aët. 4, 5 (Π. τ. ἥγεμ.) his name has been omitted. — **Diocles**: see the preface to this chapter (p. 220). We may also refer to Vindician. 19: *anima in cordis altitudine habens rationabilem virtutem, quae tendit usque ad corporis fines, omnes sensus perficit* (cf. Wellmann, *Frag. d. griech. Ärzte*, 1, 77/8); Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curat.* 5, 22 (Wellm. *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 14; constitution of the text according to Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 204₁): Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, Διοκλῆς καὶ τῶν Στωικῶν ἡ ξυμμορία τὴν καρδίαν ἀπεκλήρωσαν τοῦτω (sc. τῷ ἥγεμ.); see Wellm., *op. cit.*, 1, 84). It is possible that in Aët. 4, 5, 7 we should read Διοκλῆς instead of Διογένης, as has been supposed by Diels (who, however, in *Dox. Gr.*, 204₁ recants this conjecture): Δ. ἐν τῇ ἀρτηριακῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς καρδίας, ἥτις ἐστὶ πνευματικὴ (sc. εἶναι φησι τὸ ἥγεμ.). Cf. also Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 144, and Vindician. 41 (Wellm., 233): *animae regimen in corde consistit, quae per subtilitatem spiritus seminata est per omnem corporis regionem*. — For Herophilus, Erasistratus, and Hippocrates, see the note on § 5. — **omnibus plures Christiani**: references to the large number of the Christians are frequent in Tert.'s writings since *apol.* 1, 7 (see the note on 30, 3). — **apud**: cf. *apol.* 41, 1: *apud quos deus spernitur*; Gagnér, 140 seqq. — **deducimur**: A gives *ducimur*; it is easy to understand that the prefix *de-* was left out after *de utroque*: similarly, in 3, 2 we find *ducunt* instead of *deducunt* after *aliunde*; the clausula, too, is favourable to the reading *deducunt* (2γ, otherwise 4). For *deducere* = ὀδηγεῖν (Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen*, 111), *docere*, see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 272, 60/79. To explain this sense we must start from Joh. 16, 13 (ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὀδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀληθεῖαν πᾶσαν), a passage frequently quoted or alluded to by Tert.: *v. v.* 1: *deducet vos in omnem veritatem*; *mon.* 3: *ad deducendam disciplinam in omnem veritatem*; *praescr.* 8, 34/5; 22, 33/4; 28, 3 (*mon.* 2: *ducel*). A similar use of this verb occurs in *pud.* 19 (262, 12/3): *hanc aequalitatem spiritus sancti qui observaverit, ab ipso deducetur in sensus eius*; in *adv. Marc.* 3, 14 (400, 4/6) it has become almost equivalent to *docere*: *et deducet te, inquit* (Ps. 44, 5), *mirifice dextera tua, virtus scilicet gratiae spiritualis, qua Christi agnitio deducitur*; it is, however, only in this passage and in 43, 10 that it has a personal object and is strictly synonymous to *docere*. *deductor* = *doctor* is found for the first time in the *Itala* and in Tert. (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 283, 80 seqq.). On the other hand, *ducere*

is found nowhere in the sense of *docere*: in *ad nat.* 2, 2, 15: *Arcesilaus trinam formam divinitatis ducit* (A), Borleffs' conjecture *inducit* is also supported by the clausula; in *Did. apost.* 68, 4 Hauler: *hii qui bene ducti sunt*, the form *ducti* instead of *docti* is only due to orthography (Tidn., *Did.*, 103. 254; probably the same holds good of *disp. Arch. et Man.* 38 (Routh, *reliq. sacr.* IV): *qui videntur sibi omnem scripturam posse intelligere et ita se ductores statuerunt iis qui se audire voluissent*). All the same, the use of this verb in such passages as *Cypr. Gall. Genes.* 584: *dum decus adiectum* (sc. Abrahæ) *vocalis littera ducit* and *Avit. carm.* 6, 388: *quidquid Salomon per clara proverbia duxit* is perhaps to be regarded as an intermediate case. — *recessu*: *Prud. Cathem.* 4, 27: *in cordis medii sinu ac recessu*; *Cassian. instit. lib.* 5, 10: *recessibus nostri cordis*. — *consecratum*: *res.* 15 (44, 23): *in cerebro . . . principalitas sensuum consecrata est*; *Chalcid. comm.* 100: *ex ea parte membrorum vitalium, in quibus pontificium vivenditum est*; *Gregor. Nyss. de opif. hom.* 12: οἱ δὲ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἀφιεροῦντες τῷ λογισμῷ; a fragment of Hippocrates quoted by the *Anon. Darembergii*, cf. p. 220: ὁ δὲ Ἰ. τὸν μὲν νοῦν φησιν ἐν τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ τετάχθαι καθάπερ τι ἱερὸν ἄγαλμα ἐν ἀκροπόλει τοῦ σώματος; *Cael. Aurelian. morb. chron.* 1, 4, 60: *sive quod in capite fiat* (sc. *epilepsia sacra passio appellatur*), *quod multorum philosophorum iudicio sacram templum est partis animæ in corpore natae*; cf. also *Orig. comm. in Thren.*, frag. XLIX: ψυχῆς δὲ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν λογικόν. Perhaps Tert. had also in mind such passages as *Sen. frag.* 123 Haase (= *Lact. div. inst.* 6, 25, 3): (deus) *in suo cuique consecrandus est pectore* (cf. *Lact.* § 15); *Min. Fel.* 32, 2: *nonne melius in nostra dedicandus est* (sc. deus) *mente, in nostro immo consecrandus est pectore?*; *Lact. de ira dei* 24, 14; *Prud. cathem.* 4, 16/7.

4. In the preface to this chapter (p. 221) we have already remarked that Tert., when quoting scriptural texts for the purpose of demonstrating that the ἡγεμονικόν is situated in the heart, may have been influenced by Greek philosophers who, from Plato downwards, in this and similar contexts made use of verses from Homer; cf. *Plato Phædo* 94 D/E: 'στῆθος δὲ πλῆξας . . . ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης'. ἄρ' οἷε αὐτὸν ταῦτα ποιῆσαι διανοοῦμενον ὡς ἀρμονίας αὐτῆς οὔσης καὶ οἷας ἄγεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ σώματος παθημάτων, ἀλλ' οὐχ οἷας ἄγειν τε ταῦτα καὶ δεσπόζειν, etc. (in *Resp.* 4, 441 B he connects the same passage with his doctrine of the three parts of the soul). It was especially Chrysippus who used to base his psychological statements on almost endless quotations from Homer and Euripides, as is shown by the numerous fragments of the first book of his treatise *Περὶ ψυχῆς* preserved by Galen (*St. V. F.* 2, 905/11); we may also refer to Heraclides, *Allegor. Homer.* 18: ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς εἴληχε τὸν ὑποκάρδιον χώρον, ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς τοῦτο ποιήσει σαφὲς ἐν τῇ κατὰ μνηστήρων ὀργῇ, καθάπερ οἶκόν τινα τῆς μισοπονηρίας θυροκρουστῶν τὴν καρδίαν. 'Στῆθος . . . ἔτλης'. 'Αφ' ἧς γὰρ αἱ θυμικαὶ ῥέουσι πηγαί, πρὸς ταύτην ὁ λόγος ἀποκλίνων. The present passage was imitated by Tert. himself in *res.* 15 (44, 18/21): *hanc denique carnis speciem arcem animæ etiam*

dominus in suggillatione cogitatum taxat: 'quid cogitatis in cordibus vestris nequam?' et 'qui conspexerit ad concupiscendum, iam adulteravit in corde', and by Hier. in *ep.* 64, 1, 3: *quaeritur, ubi sit animae principale. Plato in cerebro, Christus monstrat in corde: 'beati . . . videbunt'* (Matth. 5, 8) *et 'de corde . . . malae'* (ib. 15, 19) *et 'quid . . . vestris'* (ib. 9, 4); cf. also Orig. *comm. in Joh.* 6, 38, 189: τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν . . . κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τυγχάνον. — **dispectorem** (Τρ.; not mentioned in Hoppe's list), cf. Thes. 1. L. V, 1: 1394, 40/8; other instances are found in *apol.* 45, 1 (V); *ad ux.* 2, 8; *test. anim.* 2 (136, 23/4): *sunt qui etsi deum non negent, dispectorem (despectorem A, just as here; see the appar. crit. on 13, 1) plane et arbitrum et iudicem non putent.* It is doubtful whether Tert. alludes here to Prov. 24, 12 (ὁτι κύριος καρδίας πάντων γινώσκει; Vulg. *qui inspector est cordis*), a passage quoted by him nowhere else, or to 1 Regn. 16, 7 (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν, Vulg. *Dominus autem intuetur cor*), which he adduces three times (*cult. fem.* 2, 13, 1: *deus conspector est cordis; praescr.* 3, 20/1: *deus in praecordia contemplatur; orat.* 17 (191, 2/3); *deus autem non vocis, sed cordis auditor est, sicut conspector*). — **scrutatorem**: cf. Sap. Sal. 1, 6: καὶ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐπίσκοπος ἀληθείας (sc. ὁ θεός); Vulg. *et cordis illius scrutator est verus*. — **prophetes . . . probatur**: *adv. Marc.* 5, 15 (628, 25 *seqq.*): *ad formam spiritalis et propheticae gratiae atque virtutis . . . ut et futura praenuntiet et occulta cordis revelet et sacramenta edisserat*; for more details, see the note on 9, 4. — **recogitatus**: cf. 6, 8. — **praevenit** (found as a transitive verb from Ovid and Livy downwards) almost = *praeoccupat*, cf. Tidn., *Did.*, 212. — **credi in iustitiam**: for *credere* in followed by an *accus.* (the *ablat.* is avoided here by Tert.: Löfst., *Apol.*, 38), see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 40; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 128/30; Goelz., *Jér.*, 349. — **qui viderit . . . in corde**: for the numerous and very divergent quotations of this verse in Tert.'s writings, see Aalders, 35; the passage is very frequently adduced in patristic literature (cf. e. g. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.* 231₂). Note the elaborate structure of this paragraph, which is entirely composed of *tricola*:

1. *Si enim scrutatorem . . . legimus,*
si etiam prophetes . . . probatur,
si deus ipse . . . nequam',

2. *si et David . . . deus',*
et Paulus . . . iustitiam',
et Ioannes . . . reprehendi',

3. *si postremo . . . in corde'.*

dilucet followed by an *accus. c. inf.* is found in two other passages only, viz. Gell. 6, 10, 3 and Apul. *apol.* 67. — **intentio** 'charge', a law term (e. g. Gai. 4, 41; in *apol.* 27, 1 and 46, 1 (quoted by Beck, 125) we should read *intentionem*); perhaps the same sense is to be assumed in *pall.* 4, 8: *ensoriae intentionis episcynio disperso*. — **conveniat** = *accuset* (Thes. 1. L. IV: 830, 3/831, 18; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 81; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 74; Heumann-Seckel, s. v. 4); Beck, 125₁); for the

meaning 'invenire, deprehendere, nancisci', which is very frequent in Tert., see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 125. — **thesauro**: Luc. 6, 45: ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας. The form *thensaurus* is also given by A in 57, 9, whereas *thesaurus* is found in 24, 3, 25, 7, and 46, 9; hence it seems advisable to put the latter form here too, though it is true that many authors, even Cicero and Varro, are not always consistent in these matters (cf. e. g. Svenn., *Pallad.*, 107/8 and Andersson, 84/5).

5. **Heraclitum**: this note almost certainly derives from Aenesidemus (cf. Introduction, p. 30*), as is shown by Sext. Empir. *adv. math.* 7, 349 (cf. 8, 286): οἱ μὲν ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος (τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λέγουσιν), ὡς Αἰνησίδημος κατὰ Ἡράκλειτον; cf. also Aët. 4, 3, 12: Ἡ. τὴν μὲν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχὴν ἀναθυμίασιν ἐκ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ὕρῶν, τὴν δὲ ἐν τοῖς ζώοις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκτὸς καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναθυμιάσεως, ὁμογενῇ. Of course Heraclitus knew nothing of a ἡγεμονικόν (O. Gigon, *Unters. zu Heraklit*, 114, referring to this passage remarks: "Das muss aus Heraklit irgendwie herausgedeutet worden sein; ἡγεμονικόν ist stoisch"; cf. also Gigon, *Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie* (Basel 1945), 230), but the same may be said with regard to all philosophers quoted in this passage; the lists of δόγματα τῶν διαφωνούντων δογματικῶν made by the Sceptics often contain inaccuracies. — **Moschionem**: Moschion, a physician who seems to have been an adherent of the methodical school (Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 207₁), lived between Asclepiades of Bithynia (second half of the first century b. C.) and Asclepiades younger and Aphrodis (second half of the first century of the Christian era; s. Deichgräber, *R. E.* XVI, 349). His name is never mentioned in doxographical literature known to us; we may be certain that it was added here by Soranus, who in *gyn.* 2, 29 (75, 13 Ilb.) quotes his treatise *de raphano* (Plin. n. h. 19, 87) and in other places, too, has made use of his works (see Galen XII, 416 Kühn). — **ventilari**: *Did. apost.* 32, 26 Hauler: *mens eius ventilatur*; *Prud. Hamart. praef.* 57: *mens in cerebro ventilatur ebrio*. — **Platonem** (*Tim.* 69 D *seqq.*; 90 A): Aët. 4, 5, 1: Π. Δημόκριτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ κεφαλῇ (Theodoret. *graec. affect. curat.* 5, 22; Albinus *Isag.* 23). — **Xenocraten**: see the discussion of the relevant fragments (70/2; this passage is frag. 72) by Heinze, *Xenokrates*, 65/7. The information given here is found nowhere else; according to frag. 71 (Lact. *de opif. dei* 16), Xenocrates believed the soul to be diffused throughout the body. — **Hippocraten**: Theodoret. *loc. cit.*: Ἰ. μὲν γὰρ καὶ Δημόκριτος καὶ Πλάτων ἐν ἐγκεφάλῳ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ ἡγεμ.) ἰδρῶσθαι εἰρήκασιν; for more passages (also with regard to Herophilus and Erasistratus), see the preface to this chapter, p. 220. We may also refer to the anecdote recorded by [Soran.] *Vita Hippocr.* 12 (177, 14 Ilberg). — **sed nec**: cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 93; Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 76 *seqq.*; Petersson, 32. — **Herophilus**: Aët. 4, 5, 4: Ἡ. ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου κοιλίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶ καὶ βάσις. — **Strato**: probably the pupil of Erasistratus (Soran. *gyn.* 4, 14 (145, 4 Ilberg): Στράτων . . . ὁ Ἐρασιστράτεος; Diog. Laërt. 5, 61). — **Erasistratus**: Aët. 4, 5, 3: Ἐ. περὶ τὴν μήνιγγα τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου, ἣν ἐπικρανίδα λέγει; Theodoret., *loc. cit.* (almost iden-

tical); Gregor. Nyss. *de opif. hom.* 12: 'Ο δὲ ἕτερος (Greg. had mentioned Herophilus just before) πᾶσι τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις οἷον ὑποβάθραν τινὰ καὶ ῥίζαν εἶναι λέγει τὴν μήνιγγα (οὕτω γὰρ ὀνομάζουσι τὸν περιεκτικὸν τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου ὑμένα). — **membranulis**: the plural is used erroneously instead of the singular. Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 208/9) has shown that this inaccuracy is due to Soranus, as Pollux, who also consulted him, has the same erroneous reading (*Onomast.* 2, 226): εἴτ' ἐν παρεγκεφαλίδι ἢ μήνιγγιν ὡς πολλοῖς τῶν ἱατρῶν δοκεῖ. According to Erasistratus, the pia mater was the seat of the ἡγεμονικόν. The exact information (borrowed from doxography, but not through the intermediary of Soranus) is found in Philo *quod det. pot. insid. sol.* 90: ὄντα τὸν ἀνθρώπινον νοῦν μήνιγγι ἢ καρδίᾳ. — **Strato Physicus**: Aët. 4, 5, 2 (Theodoret.): Σ. ἐν μεσοφρύφ. — **Epicurus**: Aët. 4, 5, 5 (Theodoret.): Παρμενίδης καὶ 'Ε. ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ θώρακι (*ib.* 4, 4, 6; Lucr. 3, 140; Heinze, *Lucr. III*, 39 and 68). — **lorica**: cf. e. g. Potam. *tract.* 2 (P. L. 8, 1415): *intra loricae sacri pectoris*. — **quod** is again equivalent to *ut* (or *id quod*); see the note on 10, 6. — **Aegyptii**: refers to the Hermetic writings; cf. *exc.* 24, 13 (I: 502, 24 *seqq.* Scott): ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῆς γῆς κεῖται ἡ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν ἱερωτάτη χώρα, τὸ δὲ μέσον τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου σώματος [μόνης] τῆς καρδίας ἐστι σηκός, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ὀρμητήριόν ἐστι <ν ἢ> καρδία. See Scott III, 575 (who has overlooked this passage); cf. also Horapollo 1, 36: Ἑρμῇ . . . πάσης καρδίας καὶ λογισμοῦ δεσπότη (Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 312). A different view is found in *libell.* 10, 11 (I: 194, 13/5 Scott): ὅσα οὖν προσήνεται τῷ ὑμένι τῆς κεφαλῆς ταύτης <ἐν ᾧ . . .> ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ, ἀθάνατα πέφυκεν. — After **divinarum** we should supply *scripturarum* (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 43/4), or rather *litterarum* (for this ellipsis, see Engelbrecht, *Ztschr. f. d. österr. Gymnas.*, 41 (1890), 485). From Tert.'s works we may adduce *pud.* 16 (252, 16): *in secunda Corinthiorum*; *ad nat.* 2, 1, 8: *qui Rerum Divinarum . . . commentatus*; *adv. Iud.* 13, 97: *in Regnorum legimus*. — **commentatores**: it seems impossible to retain the reading given by A (*commemoratores*), for *commemorator* only occurs in two passages, in which it has a totally different meaning, viz. *adv. Marc.* 4, 26 (512, 4): (Christus) *commemorator, non obliterator vetustatum*, and *Aug. serm.* 53, 8: *cetera . . . disputatore non egent, commemoratore opus habent* = "commemoranda tantum sunt" (*Thes. l. L.*). On the other hand, *commentator* = 'author' is very frequent in Tert. — **Orphei vel Empedoclis**: it does not seem probable that Tert. in his source found both names connected with this verse; we should rather suppose that he was not quite certain about the name of the author (see the note on 46, 5: *Aristodemus vel Aristophon*) or that he only affects ignorance (cf. the note on 9, 4: *nescio quid*). — **namque . . . sensus**: Emp. B 105, 3 Diels: αἶμα γὰρ ἀνθρώποις περικαρδίον ἐστὶ νόημα (for the interpretation of this verse, see Wellm., *Frag. d. griech. Ärzte*, 1, 72/3; Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 127 *seqq.*; Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 176). The translation may be due to Tert. himself (see the note on 18, 1). Chalcid. *comm.* 218 has the following translation: *sanguine cordis enim noster viget intellectus*.

6. Protagoras . . . Chrysippus: the words *vel ab istis retusus Asclepiades* show that these authors must be physicians. Diels (*Dox. Gr.*, 204) proposes to read *Pythagoras* instead of *Protagoras* on account of Aët. 4, 5, 10: Πυθαγόρας τὸ μὲν ζωτικὸν περὶ τὴν καρδίαν, τὸ δὲ λογικὸν καὶ νοερὸν περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. Much more is to be said for the supposition of Pamelius and Junius that Praxagoras must have been meant here. This name is found in several places together with that of Chrysippus the Cnidian physician, who is also mentioned here (von Arnim, *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 880, is certainly wrong in supposing that Tert. here means Chrysippus the Stoic), e. g. Cels. *praef.* 2: *Diocles Carystius, deinde Praxagoras et Chrysippus*; Porphyr. in *schol. ad Hom. Iliad.* 11, 515: τοῦ γὰρ διαιτητικοῦ Ἡρόδιχος μὲν ἤρξατο, συνετέλεσε δὲ καὶ Ἱπποκράτης, Πραξαγόρας, Χρύσιππος. According to Praxagoras, the πνεῦμα ψυχικόν has its seat in the heart, whence it is conducted through the body by the nerves; cf. the preface to this chapter (p. 220), Wellm., *Frag. d. griech. Ärzte*, 1, 15, and Athen. 15, 687: διὰ τὸ νομίζειν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τὴν ψυχὴν καθιδρῦσθαι, ὡς Πραξαγόρας καὶ Φιλότιμος οἱ ἱατροὶ παραδεδώκασι. So we may suppose that Tert. found the name of Praxagoras in his source (Caelius Aurelianus, too, quotes him very frequently); however, this is not sufficient reason to put his name into the text, for Tert.'s writings are full of inaccuracies (see the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3; for more details, see Waltz, *Ét.*, 77; 201; 368/9; 477; Harnack, *Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1914, 332 *seqq.*; Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 68₁; 101 *seqq.*; Anrich, *Myster.*, 9₃). — Apollodorus: three physicians of this name are known, two of them (A. of Citium and A. of Tarentum) being mentioned by Plin. *n. h.* 20, 25; for the third A., who lived in the third century b. Chr. and composed a treatise *Περὶ θηρίων*, see Wellmann, *R. E. I.*, 2895. Our materials are far too scanty to decide whom Soranus meant here. — *retusus* = *refutatus*, cf. 3, 3. — *muscas abigat*: the usual expression, cf. e. g. Cic. *de orat.* 2, 247: *puer, abige muscas*, and Phaedr. 4, 24, 12. — *sine corde et cerebro*: this may be a proverbial phrase (cf. e. g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 251: *cor meum et cerebrum . . . finditur*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 10 (449, 2): *inspice cor Pontici aut cerebrum*), though it may also be due to the contents of this chapter only. Chrysippus (see the note on § 4) in this context referred to the ἀκάρδιοι, etc., cf. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 884 (*Galen de Hipp. et Plat. Plac.* 3, 5, p. 297 Müller: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν „ἀκάρδιος” ἐξηγεῖται προσηγορίαν; *ib.* p. 309: μετὰ δὲ τὴν προγεγραμμένην ῥῆσιν ἑτέρα τις ἐφεξῆς ἐστὶν ἐν ᾗ τοὺς ἀσπλάγχνους τε καὶ τοὺς οὐκ ἔχοντας ἐγκέφαλον ἐξηγεῖται).

16. Plato's division of the soul. Natural and unnatural affections.

“Plato divides the soul into a rational and an irrational part; we too accept this division, provided that only the rational part is regarded as belonging to the nature of the soul, because it has proceeded from God, its rational creator; the irrational part is a later addition, which proceeded from the instigation of the devil, and afterwards became one with the soul (§ 1). If, on the other hand, this part should

be considered also to belong to the nature of the soul, it would have originated from God, a supposition which Plato, too, regards as absurd. But as sin has proceeded from the devil, and every sin is irrational, we may be certain that this irrational part is due to the devil (§ 2). — I also want to discuss Plato's subdivision of this part into anger (θυμικόν) and desire (ἐπιθυμητικόν), as both affections also appear in Christ (§ 3) (in fact the entire trichotomy of Plato may be found again in the personality of our Lord) (§ 4). Hence anger and desire should not be considered to spring from the *irrationalis* exclusively, for in Christ they must have been rational. God, too, possesses desire and wrath, which are of a rational kind (§ 5). Men as well may have rational affections, as is shown by the apostle (§ 6); but he also speaks of an irrational anger which is due to the devil, the creator of our second, and spurious, nature (§ 7)".

The contents of this chapter are based on conceptions frequently found in Tert.'s works. Being created by God, the soul cannot be unworthy of Him (*adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (306, 22/3): *nihil etenim deus indignum se fecisset . . . etsi omne opus inferius est suo artifice*); hence it is rational. Irrational anger and desire cannot have proceeded from God, and for this reason do not form part of the soul, but belong to its *corruptio*. If, on the other hand, Holy Scripture mentions a wrath of Christ, and the apostle sometimes permits us to desire something, the only possible solution is that anger and desire are to be divided into an irrational kind originating from the devil and not belonging to the nature of the soul, and a rational one, which on account of this very rationality is to be regarded as a function of the *anima rationalis*. The chief advantage of this theory is that it preserves the unity of the soul.

So this chapter is dominated by two conceptions, both of which are of the highest importance for Tert.: the corruption of the soul by sin, and the reality of the affections of God and Christ. This corruption has proceeded from the sin of Adam, and has been transmitted by the *vitium originis*; it has become second nature to us, though it is not as powerful as the original, rational, and good nature of the soul. The clearest exposition of this subject is found in 41, 1: *Malum igitur animae, praeter quod (= id quod) ex obventu spiritus nequam superstruitur* (i. e. apart from the sinfulness to which in the course of his life everybody is seduced by the evil spirit, and which is to be kept separate from original sin) *ex originis vitio antecedit, naturale quodammodo. Nam, ut diximus, naturae corruptio alia natura est, habens suum deum et patrem, ipsum scilicet corruptionis auctorem, ut tamen insit et bonum animae, illud principale, illud divinum atque germanum et proprie naturale*. So the evil can only 'obscure' the good, but not 'extinguish' it (41, 2); cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 17 (635, 21/2): *diabolo . . . captante naturam, quam et ipse iam infecit delicti semine inlato* (§ 7 in this chapter: *avenarum superseminatorem, res.* 34 (73, 15/21), and especially *test. anim.* 3 (138, 1/7); Esser, 106/7).

The special attention paid to the reality of the affections of Christ

is due to Tert.'s polemics against Marcion, cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 18/20): *aut in totum immobilem et stupentem deum concepisse debuerat* (sc. Marcion) — *et quid illi cum Christo, molesto et Iudaeis per doctrinam et sibi per Iesum?* (for this passage, see Bill, 85/6, who, however, is wrong in supposing that Marcion identified his *deus bonus*, whom he considered to be completely free from affections, with Christ); the same applies to the discussion of the affections of God (cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 264*/5*, and the notes on § § 4/5; for the polemics of Novatianus against Marcion, see Harnack, *op. cit.*, 335*, for Marcion's alterations of the text of Holy Scripture, which he made in support of his theory, *ib.*, 48/9).

So the entire chapter may be explained by means of conceptions familiar to Tert.; there is no necessity to assume any influence from philosophic discussions on the nature of anger (the resemblance of Tert.'s theory to that of the Peripatetics is only apparent; Esser's explanation (p. 110) is wrong). It is only the doxographical note contained in the initial sentence which has been copied from a non-scriptural authority (Soranus or Albinus; see the Introduction, p. 44₃*). Karpp's remark (p. 37₁₀) that this chapter should be regarded as an addition to ch. 14/5, is wrong: in ch. 14 Tert. discusses the *partes animae* in general, in ch. 15 the ἡγεμονικόν (= τὸ λογικόν, see 14, 2), in ch. 16 its opposite, the ἄλογον.

1. Est . . . pertinens: similarly, 10, 1: *Pertinet ad statum fidei*. For Tert.'s use of the *coniugatio periphrastica*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 59/60; here the part. is almost equivalent to an adjective. — *quod . . . partitur*: cf. 14, 2. — *applaudimus*: there are only two other instances of a dative joined on to *applaudere*, viz. *res.* 11 (40, 17) and *Apul. met.* 3, 9 (an exception is to be made for *sibi a.*, which becomes fairly frequent in Latin of the last period, e. g. *Hier. ep.* 133, 3, 1). — *Naturale*: Esser (58) rightly observes on this term: "Das Wort natürlich steht so bei Tert. im Sinne von wesentlich, um Eigenschaften zu bezeichnen, welche der Substanz gemäss ihrer Konstitution und seit ihrem Ursprunge zukommen". — *a rationali . . . auctore*: *paen.* 1, 2: (deo) *rationis auctore*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 23 (320, 22/3): *sicut naturalia, ita rationalia esse debere in deo omnia*; d'Alès, *Théol.*, 36₃; Rauch, 10. — *Quid enim . . . ediderit*: this refers to nature in general, cf. 43, 7. — *quod . . . emisericit*: cf. 9, 7. — *instinctu*: this subst. is found from *Cic. divin.* 1, 18, 34 downwards: *instinctu divino afflatuque*; in Christian literature it usually denotes the instigation of the devil or of the demons, e. g. *Lucif. Calaur. de non parc.* 23 (259, 8 H.): *instinctu diaboli*; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 6 (64, 17 Batiff.-Wilm.); *Aug. gen. ad litt.* 11, 2, 4; cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (348, 3/4): *diabolum . . . instinctorem delicti*. The word occurs in a different context in 27, 5: *animam instinctu, carnem actu* (sc. fungi in concubitu); *res.* 34 (73, 18); *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 16): *huius praesumptionis instinctum*; 2 *Thess.* 2, 11, *ib.* 5, 16 (631, 10/1): *instinctum fallaciae* (ἐνεργείαν πλάνης; cf. Quispel, 107). — *transgressionis* (also *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 = 339, 2. 4/5) is of course a translation of παράβασις (e. g. *Gal.* 3, 19), just as *trans-*

gressus of παραβάτης (for this word, see Mohrm., *Aug.*, 210). — **coadoleverit** (also 19, 3) is a Tp; the verb is used in the same way in [Clem.] *recogn.* 1, 21: *peccatum quod coadolevit hominibus*. For this metaphor, cf. Norden, *Verg. Aen. VI*³, 311, who points out that σύμφυτον (προσπεφυκός) κακόν is a combination frequently found in this context since Plato *Resp.* 10, 609 A/B; *Tim.* 42 A. C; *Phaedo* 81 C (cf. also Greg. Nyss. *orat. catech.* 26 (100, 6 Srawley); *ib.* 35 = 134, 16). — **ad instar . . . naturalitatis**: the subst. *nat.* (also 43, 6) is used by Tert. only. In 41, 1 the *malum animae* is qualified in the same way as *naturale quodammodo* (for the definition of habit as *altera natura* (since Cic. *fin.* 5, 74), see Otto, *Sprichw.*, 90/1; Weyman, A. L. L. 8, 401).

2. **cum . . . Plato solum rationale dicat, ut in anima dei ipsius**: the meaning of this sentence is not quite clear. The most plausible interpretation is: “when Plato mentions the *rationale* only as being present in the soul of God Himself”, i. e. “declares nothing irrational to be present in the soul of God” (we should supply ὅν after *ipsius*, for which cf. the note on 5, 4). The connecting of the genit. *dei* with *anima* is supported by the words *a deo, a quo est inrationale alienum*, by the clause (§ 3) *ut . . . commune sit nobis . . . rationale cum deo*, and by the circumstance that the conclusion of the first syllogism in this paragraph (*aeque inrationale de deo erit*) presupposes that the soul of God should only possess the *rationale*. If the meaning were: “When Plato mentions the *rationale* only as being a part of God Himself in the <human> soul”, we should rather expect *ut in anima de deo ipso* (sc. ὅν; cf. *inrationale de deo erit*). In the first sentence of § 3 (*Plato soli deo segregans rationale*) the idea is completely different, as Tert. there says that, according to Plato, only God is completely rational (*segregans*!), whereas the human soul contains both a rational and an irrational element; hence it is necessary to discuss the *inrationale* as well. It is not clear to which passage from Plato Tert. alludes here; perhaps we may refer to *Tim.* 69 C, where God appears as τῶν θεῶν . . . δημιουργός and creates the ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον Himself; cf. also Albin. *Ἐπτ.* 9 (163, 29 H.): εἴτε γὰρ νοῦς ὁ θεὸς ὑπάρχει εἴτε νοερόν. The complicated argument is best analysed in this way: I. A. *deus auctor naturae est*. B. *animae natura naturale est*. C. *anima naturam suam a deo sortita est*. II A. *deus solum rationalis est*. <B. *rationale tantum rationale creare potest*. C. *deus solum rationale creat*>. The conclusions of these two syllogisms give a new syllogism: III. A. *anima naturam suam a deo sortita est*. B. *deus solum rationale creat*. C. *animae natura solum rationalis est* (i. e. “*inrationale naturae animae adscribi non potest*”). — **Sed enim a diabolo . . . a quo et delictum**: this syllogism runs as follows: “A. *omnia delicta a diabolo sunt*. B. *omnia delicta inrationalia sunt*. C. *ergo inrationale a diabolo est*. This argument obviously contains a sophism; it would only be valid, if B would contain: *omne delictum inrationale est et omne inrationale delictum est*. A similar sophism is found in 7, 4. — **delicti** = *peccati*, a meaning frequently found in Tert. (see Thes. I. L. V, 1: 460, 76/82), which of course was borrowed from the idiom of lawyers (Beck, 116/7). Cf. Rufin.-

Orig. *homil. in Levit.* 5, 4: *videtur quidem in scripturis divinis frequenter peccatum pro delicto et delictum pro peccato indifferenter et absque aliqua distinctione nominari*; however, in the same treatise (6, 31 seq.) the *delictum* as the lighter transgression is contrasted with the *peccatum* (the wording of the original cannot be stated with certainty). Baehrens (*ad loc.*) refers to Aug. *Quaest. in Heptateuch.* 3, 20: *fortassis ergo peccatum est perpetratio mali, delictum autem desertio boni*. See also von Soden, *Der lat. Paulustext bei Marcion und Tert.*, 244. — **Proinde delicti diversitas**: there is no necessity to alter the text; the right interpretation was already given by Lindner: “i. e. quod non, ut reliqua creatura, a deo est conditum (sc. delictum)”. *diversitas* here means “the fact of being different <from all existing things>”, “the complete isolation”. A similar sense is found in 11, 2: *spiritus distinctionem* (see the note); cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 21 (317, 19): *dei novitas atque diversitas*. *Proinde* means “hence”, “thus”, as in 19, 1 and 41, 4, etc. Two subsequent sentences beginning with *proinde* also occur in *apol.* 49, 5/6. — **diversitas . . . distantia**: for the variation, cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (425, 16/7): *quid differentiam rerum ad distantiam interpretaris potestatum?*; *ib.* 4, 25 (508, 8/10): *pro differentia enim mercedum operarum quoque credenda distantia est*. — **horum ex distantia auctorum**: *pat.* 5 (6, 19/20): *eadem discordia est rerum quae et auctorum* (sc. dei et diaboli).

3. **Plato . . . rationale**: for the interpretation of these words, see the note on the first sentence of § 2. — **subdividit**: *Tp* (also *adv. Iud.* 8, 115 and 11, 65). — **indignativum** is *Tp*; **concupiscentivum** is used by Tert. only. Plato's trichotomy of the soul (*Resp.* 4, 438 D seqq. (8, 548 C seqq.; 9, 580 D seqq.); *Phaedrus* 246 A seqq. (253 C seqq.); *Tim.* 69 C seqq.; 89 E) is frequently mentioned in doxographical literature, e. g. Aët. 4, 4, 1; Epiphan. *prooem.* I (D D G 587, 10) and *adv. haeres.* 3, 2, 9 (*ib.* 591, 19); [Galen] *hist. philos.* 24 (*ib.* 615, 1/2). — **vocant . . . appellant**: the plural betrays a doxographical source (Aët.: τὸ γὰρ ἄλογον διαίρουσιν εἰς τε τὸ θυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, the subject being Πυθαγόρας Πλάτων); however, it is also possible to understand *Platonici* (cf. 6, 1 and Epiphan. *prooem.*, *loc. cit.*). — **retractandum** here = *agendum*, not = *dubitandum*, as is mostly the case (cf. 2, 6). — **quae in Christo deprehenduntur**: similarly, *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (513, 1): *hic enim sufficit, si et in Christo repperiuntur* (sc. quae reprehendunt Marcionitae in creatore); *cor.* 8, 2/5: *iam enim audio dici et alia multa ab eis prolata quos saeculum deos credidit, tamen et . . . in ipso Christo deprehendi*; *ib.* 10, 2. We do not know whence Tert. got his information concerning lions and flies; of course it is possible that Soranus discussed this subject and subscribed to the view held by Aristotle (*hist. anim.* 8, 588a 18 seqq.; 9, 608a 13 seqq.) and Posidonius (see Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrb., Suppl.* 24, 619; P. Rabbow, *Antike Schriften über Seelenheilung und Seelenleitung*, 1 (Leipsic-Berlin 1914), 13/7), who endowed animals with affections, whereas the contrary opinion was defended by the ancient Stoics (for Chrysippus, see Pohlenz, 611; W. A. Allers, *De . . . Senecae libr. de ira fontibus* (Göttingen

1881), 32/3). At all events, the question whether the lion possesses θυμός (or τὸ θυμικόν), was much discussed, as is shown by *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 906 (Galen *de Hipp. et Plat. plac.*, p. 274 Müller): ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἔχει ὁ λέων θυμόν, ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι Τυρταίου (frag. 13 Bergk) γιγνώσκομεν, οὐ μὴν Χρυσίππῳ γ' ἔπρεπε παραθέσθαι τὸ ἔπος ἀφαιρουμένῳ τοὺς λέοντας τὸν θυμόν. οὐδὲν γάρ, ὡς οἴεται, τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων οὔτε τὸ θυμοειδὲς οὔτε τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν οὔτε τὸ λογιστικόν ἔχει, ἀλλὰ . . . παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐνάργειαν (Arnim; ἐνεργείαν MSS, which reading is certainly preferable) ἀφαιροῦνται τῶν εἰρημένων ἀπάντων αὐτὰ σχεδὸν ἅπαντες οἱ Στωϊκοί and *ib.* 789 (Anon. *schol. in Hermog. ideas*, Walz. Rh. gr. VII, p. 884): οἱ μὲν γὰρ Στωϊκοὶ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς κράσεως τῶν στοιχείων ἀποτελεῖσθαι τὴν γένεσιν· ὅταν μὲν γὰρ πλεονάσῃ τὸ θερμόν, ποιεῖ τὸν λέοντα, ὅθεν, φησί, καὶ θυμικός ἐστίν· ὅταν δὲ κατὰ λόγον καὶ σχεδὸν ἐξ ἴσου συνέλθῃ, ποιεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ταύτης τῆς δόξης προστάτης ἐγένετο καὶ Γαληνός.

4. *trinitas* occurs in the same sense in *adv. Val.* 17 (196, 22); the meaning 'Trinity' is found for the first time in Tert., e. g. *adv. Prax.* 3 (230, 13/4); for more details, see Schrijnen, *Charakter.*, 16 and Mohrm., *Aug.*, 158/9. — *quo . . . sternit*: similarly, 19, 1; *pud.* 10 (239, 19/20): *Iohannes domini vias sternens*; with the dat. (the genit. in the present passage is also supported by Act. apost. 16, 17) *orat.* 11 (187, 17): *viam orationibus sternit*. Cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 16 (311, 5/6): *scripturarum . . . advocacioni fidem sternimus*. — *quo pascha . . . concupiscit*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (559, 4/6): *ideo et adfectum suum ostendit* (sc. Christus; after this Luc. 22, 15 is quoted; cf. *ib.* l. 22/3). Other statements about the affections of Christ (all of them arising from the polemics against Marcion) are found in *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (515, 13 *seqq.*): *cur autem 'vae' audiunt* (sc. Pharisei et doctores legis) . . . *si non erat zelotes, qualem arguunt Marcionitae, delicta patrum de filiis exigentem usque in quartam nativitatem?* (it is especially the possession of these affections which shows that Christ is the son of the *deus iudex*); 4, 35 (538, 24 *seqq.*); 4, 41 (561, 8/23). In *adv. Prax.* 16 (257, 5 *seqq.*) Tert. argues that Christ already before His incarnation possessed the *adfectus humanos*. The belief that these affections should only belong to the human nature of Christ, which view was held by the greater part of the *Patres* since Origen (see the excellent discussion on this subject by Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes*, 57/105), has never been clearly expressed by Tert.; we may, however, refer to *adv. Prax.* 16 (257, 7/8): *sic etiam adfectus humanos sciebat iam tunc* (viz. before the incarnation), *suscceptorus etiam ipsas substantias hominis, carnem et animum*. A parallel to this passage is found in Mar. Victorin. *adv. Arium.* 3, 3: *item universalis animae λόγος et ex hoc ostenditur, quod et irascitur* (after these words Matth. 10, 15 is quoted); *item et cupit* (*ib.* 26, 39), . . . *ibi etiam ratiocinatur*. On the other hand, Chrysostomus (*homil.* 30 *ad Matth.* = P. G. 57, 364 F) denied that Christ was really angry with the Pharisees; in the so-called Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius *panar.* 30, 14) Jesus denies that he desired to eat the passover.

5. **Indignabitur deus rationaliter**: though Tert. never doubted the existence of the wrath of God (e. g. *apol.* 40, 11; *test. anim.* 2), it is his controversy with Marcion which fully developed his ideas on this subject. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 26 ('sin caused God to become a *deus iudex* and consequently a *deus irascens*'); 2, 11; 2, 16 (356, 22 *seqq.*): *stultissimi, qui de humanis divina praeiudicant, ut, quoniam in homine corruptoriae condicionis habentur huiusmodi passiones, idcirco et in deo eiusdem status existimentur*; *ib.* (357, 21 *seqq.*): *solus deus de incorruptibilitatis proprietate felix. irascetur enim, sed non exacerbabitur, sed non periclitabitur, movebitur, sed non evertetur. Omnia necesse est adhibeat propter omnia, tot sensus quot et causas: et iram propter scelestos et bilem propter ingratos et aemulationem propter superbos et quicquid non expedit malis . . . quae omnia patitur suo more, quo eum pati concedet*. For the views of the other *Patres* on this subject, see Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes*; Geffcken, *Zw. griech. Apol.*, 40; Guil. Kutsch, *In Lactant. de ira dei libr. quaest. philol.* (Leipsic 1933).

6. **Dat = concedit** (cf. the note on 10, 9). — **concupiscentiam**: a 'Christianism', which occurs in the *Itala* for the first time. — **episcopatus**: Tp.; see H. Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache*, 76. — **rationalem concupiscentiam**: it is obvious that this statement has nothing to do with the philosophic discussions on this subject (a kind of parallel may be found in the φυσική ὁργή postulated by Philodemus, *col.* 38 = p. 126 Gomperz), but may be explained from the conceptions described in the preface to this chapter. It is in the same way that Pelag. in *ep. ad. Rom.* 15, 23 by means of scriptural texts demonstrates the existence of a *bona cupiditas*. — **praecidentur** (Gal. 5, 12: ὀφελον καὶ ἀποκόβονται; Vulg. *utinam et abscindantur*): similarly, *pud.* 1 (221, 4/5): *etiam ut praeciderentur qui circumcisionem detinendam suadebant*. It is not clear whether Tert. takes this verb here in the sense of 'to castrate', which should be assumed in the original text (see Lietzmann's note, *Hdb. N. T.* 10, p. 38/9; from pagan literature cf. e. g. Sen. *de provid.* 5, 3; *SH A Helio-gabal.* 7, 2), and which is also understood by Hier. (Vall. 7, 492 D) and Pelagius in their notes (in *Thes.* 1. L. I: 152, 24/5 the passage from the Vulgate is wrongly put under the heading "abicio, respuo, tollo"); in this context the interpretation 'may they be thrown away' (which is also frequently found, e. g. Aug. *serm.* 33, 5) seems to be more natural. As to the *manus praecidendae* of the heretics and the *artifices idolorum* (*idol.* 7 (36, 19/22) and *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 = 638, 5/6), see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 64/5. — **affectu = amore**; cf. 31, 4: *affectu Euphorbi = studiis E.* (for the concrete meaning 'the beloved', see the note on 56, 2). See for this meaning, which is found since Suet., *Thes.* 1. L. I: 1190, 20 *seqq.*; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 389; Koch, *Novat.*, 280; Werner, 133.

7. **diabolus . . . ordinis**: cf. 41, 1. — **ne** is once more almost equivalent to *ut non* (see 6, 5). — **adulterae = falsae** (since Ovid *ars* 3, 643: *adultera clavis*; cf. *Thes.* 1. L. I: 881, 42/57). From Tert. cf. *ad nat.* 1, 16, 2; *pud.* 10 (240, 14); *adv. Marc.* 1, 27 (328, 28); *praescr.* 4, 11;

17, 6; = *falsarius*: *adv. Herm.* 1 (126, 14); *idol.* 1 (30, 13): *adulter* . . . *veritatis* (similarly, *praescr.* 30, 37); *apol.* 47, 9. — *avenarum superseminatorem*: *Matth.* 13, 25; cf. *adv. Prax.* 1 (228, 14/5): *fructificaverant avenae Praezanae hic quoque, superseminatae dormientibus multis in simplicitate doctrinae*; *praescr.* 31, 1/6: *revertar ad principalitatem veritatis et posteritatem mendacitatis disputandam ex illius quoque parabolae patrocínio, quae bonum semen frumenti a domino seminatum in primore constituit, avenarum autem sterilis faeni adulterium ab inimico diabolo postea superducit*. As to the interpretation of this parable (or allegory: see Klostermann, *Hdb. N. T.* 4, p. 121), cf. *exc. ex Theodoto* 53, 1: τοῦτο (sc. τὸ ὕλικόν) 'ζιζάνιον' ὀνομάζεται συμφυὲς τῇ ψυχῇ, τῷ χρηστῷ (= τῷ πνευματικῷ) σπέρματι, τοῦτο καὶ σπέρμα τοῦ διαβόλου ὡς ὁμοούσιον ἐκείνῳ. *Clem. Alex. strom.* 3, 4, 34, 3 (copied by Theodoret. *haer. fab.* 1, 16) with regard to the so-called *Antitacti* writes: λέγουσιν ὅτι ὁ μὲν θεὸς ὁ τῶν ὅλων πατὴρ ἡμῶν ἐστὶ φύσει, καὶ πανθ' ὅσα πεποίηκεν ἀγαθὰ ἐστίν. εἰς δὲ τις τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότων ἐπέσπειρεν τὰ ζιζάνια τὴν τῶν κακῶν φύσιν γεννήσας, οἷς καὶ πάντας ἡμᾶς περιέβαλεν ἀντιτάξας ἡμᾶς τῷ πατρί. Christian authors usually refer this passage to heresy, e. g. *Aug. Quaest. in Matth.*, qu. 11. Cf. also *ep. de malis doctoribus* 11, 1 (Caspari, *Briefe, Abh. u. Pred.*, p. 86): *defecerunt ex maxima parte in nobis quae Christus inseruit, et illa tantummodo vigent, quae diabolus supersevit*. For *diabolus aemulus*, see the note on 20, 5; *superseminator* is a ἁ. λ. — *interpolatorum*: *Tert.* often uses this subst. to denote the devil: *spect.* 2 (4, 8/10): *nos igitur, qui domino cognito etiam aemulum eius inspeximus, qui institutore comperto et interpolatorem una deprehendimus*; *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 2: *a diabolo . . . ab interpolatore naturae*; *test. anim.* 3 (138, 3/4): (Satanan) *totius saeculi interpolatorem*. Cf. also *apol.* 46, 18: (philosophus) *veritatis interpolator*; *praescr.* 7, 30/1: *sapientiam humanam . . . interpolatricem veritatis*.

17. The reliability of sense-perception.

"I. A discussion of the five senses is necessary, as this subject, too, has induced the heretics to pronounce false doctrines (§ 1). — II. The reliability of the senses is denied by the adherents of the Academy, according to some authorities also by Heraclitus, Diocles, and Empedocles, and at all events by Plato in the *Timaeus*. In confutation of the reliability of sight the well-known cases of the oar, the tower, the portico, and the apparent contact of the sky with the sea are instanced (§ 2); similar arguments are advanced with regard to the other senses (§ 3). The Stoics are less radical, in so far as they do not deny all truth to the senses, whilst the Epicureans regard all sense-data as perfectly true, the illusions arising only from our own opinion (§ 4). — III. However, a false opinion is due to the senses, and the senses form part of the soul. So we should not follow the last-mentioned philosophers in detaching this opinion from the senses and the senses from the soul; but all the same we must admit that there certainly is a factor which makes things appear different

from their real nature. Now, if something that is not present in the objects themselves may be communicated, why should it not be transmitted by a factor not found in the senses, but in some independent causes? (§ 5). Nor is it difficult to find these causes: in the case of the oar it is the water, in the case of the tower the air in the space between subject and object, whilst in the two last-mentioned instances the illusion is due to the weakness of human sight (§ 6). With regard to the other senses the causes of their failure are no less easy to find (§ 7). So our conclusion runs that every illusion of the senses is due to a special cause, which is quite adequate to its explanation (§ 8). Illusions are especially frequent in cases of insanity or illness; there the cause obviously lies in the insanity or illness, not in the senses (§ 9). — We may even go further and say: the causes neither are to be regarded as illuding us, for whatever must happen in this special way and in none other, is no illusion. So the notion that the senses should not be reliable, has become still more improbable; they are certainly reliable, for they transmit accurately whatever the special causes order them to transmit (§ 10). — IV. Whoever adheres to the opinion of the Academy, makes life impossible, for the senses are our primary source of knowledge (§ 11). Yet Plato <continues to disqualify the senses, though he implicitly admits their indispensability for the acquiring of knowledge: for> in the *Phaedrus*, by the mouth of Socrates, he denies that he can know himself, lest he should be obliged to testify in favour of the senses; in the *Theaetetus* he declares all knowledge to be impossible, and in the *Phaedrus* he defers all cognition to the time after death (which, however, did not prevent him from philosophizing before death!) (§ 12). — V. For us Christians it is simply impossible to question the reliability of the senses, which would force us to question the contents of Holy Scripture (§ 13), or even to follow Marcion in regarding Christ as a phantom — a view which has been adequately refuted by the words of St. John (§ 14)".

In this chapter the following parts are to be distinguished: 1) the preface (§ 1); 2) the doxographical survey (§§ 2/4); 3) the argument proving that it is not the senses, but special causes to which illusions are due, and that the senses depend on these causes, just as our opinions depend on the senses (§§ 5/10); 4) the discussion of the indispensability of the senses for human life (§ 11), which is followed by a malicious digression on Plato (§ 12); 5) the usual argument *ex scriptura sacra* (§§ 13/4). It is the controversy with the Gnostics which underlies the entire discussion; for Tert. it was a foregone conclusion that the reliability of the senses should be demonstrated at any price. So he does not trouble to investigate how sense-perception really takes place, but restricts himself to the refutation of the arguments brought forward by the Middle Academy (see especially § 11, where this purpose is expressed quite frankly). Hence the most important part of the chapter is the third, where special arguments for the unreliability of the senses are refuted.

It is usually presumed (cf. e. g. Schelowsky, 39/40, and Rauch, 17) that Tert. in this matter was strongly influenced by the Stoics. I

cannot subscribe to this view. In the first place, it should be noted that Tert. only devotes a casual remark to these philosophers, and immediately passes on to a discussion of Epicurus' theory, which he takes very seriously and with which he deals at great length. After stating the Epicurean belief that the senses never illude us, and that the source of all errors is to be found in the δόξα, he develops a theory of his own, viz. that it is not the δόξα either to which illusions are due, and that the senses are forced by special causes to transmit images of the objects in a form given to them by these causes. This theory arises before our eyes (as is often the case in Tert.'s works) from the confutation of the Epicurean doctrine, which might endanger the unity of the soul (see the comm. on § 4), but which, according to Tert.'s own words, yet contains an element of great value (§ 5: *Ceterum optime proponetur*, etc.). It should also be remembered that accounts of Stoic psychology known to us never mention a detailed refutation of the instances of illusions adduced by the Sceptics, as given by the Epicureans (see Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 44₁) and by Tert. in this chapter; the Stoics never took the senses to be perfectly reliable (Tert., too, states this quite clearly in § 4; see the note on § 4: *absciderunt . . . ab anima*). Therefore I suppose that Tert. knew no more about the Stoic view (a view eventually rejected by him) than could be found in the short note which he took from Soranus — he was never particularly interested in things not immediately useful to him (see the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3).

It is impossible to give a definite answer to the question how much Tert. owes to Soranus here. Karpp (pp. 35/6) has pointed out that the doxographical survey in §§ 2/3 has numerous parallels in the works of Sextus Empiricus: of the four instances referring to sight (oar, tower, portico, horizon) the first three are also mentioned by the latter author (*Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 118 *seq.*). According to Karpp, the example of the sense of taste which is influenced by habit corresponds with the ninth τρόπος of Aenesidemus (Sextus, *op. cit.*, 1, 141), whilst he compares the case of a floor which is rough to the hands, but smooth to the feet, with the example of a picture mentioned by Sextus (*ib.*, 1, 120). Since both Sextus and Soranus are greatly indebted to Aenesidemus (see Introduction, p. 30*), Karpp concludes that Tert.'s description was borrowed from this philosopher through the intermediary of Soranus.

No doubt, Tert. owes his knowledge of these instances to Soranus; however, the question at issue is whether Soranus shared the view of the Sceptics. Without adducing any argument for his supposition, Karpp (pp. 44/5) says: "Hier scheint Soran vor allem die Skepsis des Aenesidem und Platons Misstrauen gegen die Sinne bekämpft zu haben. Aus der Einheitlichkeit der Seele hat er vermutlich zusammen mit der Stoa die Zuverlässigkeit der Sinneskräfte gefolgert". To decide this question, we should know first, how far the 'methodical' physicians followed the Sceptics (see Introduction, p. 24*). We only know that they refused to take account of the ἀδελγὰ and 'followed the φαινόμενα', from which it is usually concluded that they regarded the data supplied

by the senses as reliable (cf. e. g. Wellmann, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 401: "An der Spitze steht der Satz: die φαινόμενα, d. h. das, was unmittelbar durch die Sinneswerkzeuge erfasst wird, sind das alleinige Kriterium, das dem Arzte als Unterlage für sein Handeln dienen kann. Die ἄδηλα, d. h. die Krankheitsursachen, Krankheitssymptome usw. sind unbedingt abzuweisen"). It should, however, be borne in mind that, according to the Sceptics themselves, ἐπεσθαι τοῖς φαινομένοις did not mean that the senses should be reliable. It might, of course, be argued that a physician as such is not very likely to distrust the senses, but this consideration can hardly be called an argument; at all events, we do not know whether or no the words τοῖς φαινομένοις ἐπεσθαι meant the same thing to an adherent of the methodical school as to the Sceptics, and so we are not justified in asserting without any proof that Soranus pronounced the reliability of sense-perception.

It is, however, highly probable that this physician, "who took up arms against all existing opinions of philosophers" (6, 6), also mentioned the arguments advanced by other schools in confutation of the Sceptic view. This supposition is supported by the circumstance that Tert.'s discussion of this subject contains several arguments borrowed from the Epicureans, for the Sceptics used to treat at great length the theory of these adversaries, which was diametrically opposite to their own view (the best exposition of the Epicurean doctrine on sense-perception is found in *Sext. Empir. adv. math.* 7, 203 *seqq.*); Tert. may also have consulted Lucretius now and again (see the comm. on § 6). The arguments at the end of § 6, which recall the Middle Stoa, were, of course, also borrowed from Soranus; on the other hand, the argument in § 7 may be of Tert.'s own finding (see the comm.).

As is generally known, the assertion that the senses are essential to human life played a prominent part in the controversy of the 'dogmatics' (the Stoics in the first place) with the Sceptics (see the note on § 11), so that Soranus must have discussed this point too; however, it is quite possible that Tert. has also used other sources. At all events, it is remarkable that the words *secunda . . . instructio* in § 11 only become clear by being compared with a passage from Cicero (*Acad.* 2, 10, 31); we must also take into account the influence of *Lucr.* 4, 500/12, especially 507 *seqq.*: *Non modo enim ratio ruat omnis, vita quoque ipsa / concidat extemplo, nisi credere sensibus ausis.*

In addition to Soranus and (perhaps) Cicero and Lucretius, Melito of Sardes is also to be mentioned who, according to Hier. *de vir. ill.* 24, composed a monograph *de sensibus*; however, as Tert. nowhere mentions this author, it is not very likely that he knew this treatise (for a parallel to Tert. *de baptismo* in a work of Melito, see Harnack, *Marcion*, 422*).

Of course we should not lose sight of the fact that the argument is mainly Tert.'s own work. We have already observed that his polemics against the heretics forced him to defend the reliability of the senses (for a similar line of thought in Athenag. and [Justin] *frag. de resurr.*, see Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 186 and 269): this is apparent from the preface

(*quoniam et hinc aliquid haereticis procuratur*) and from the *argumentum ex scriptura sacra* at the end. To this we may add a statement in the treatise *de fuga* (4, 1), which has not been provoked in the first place by the wish to combat a divergent view: *non sensus hominis praediuicat statui rerum, sed status sensui. Status enim unusquisque certum quid est et dat sensui legem ita sentiendi statum sicut est* (on the other hand, the definition of the *sensus* as *anima animae* in *c. Chr.* 12, 10/1 was strongly influenced by polemical considerations). As I have already observed, the most important modification introduced into the Epicurean theory, which for the rest was congenial to Tert., viz. the subordination of the *opinio* to the senses, was brought about by a wish to maintain the unity of the soul at any price. Finally, the 'regressive' development of the argument, which begins by stating that illusions are not due to the senses, but to special reasons, and then declares even these reasons to be 'free from guilt', is in perfect accordance with Tert.'s way of reasoning (see the prefaces to ch. 6 and 24); such 'regressions' are found in all his works.

So this chapter may be regarded as a striking example of Tert.'s usual procedure: he takes all necessary materials from his sources, but only in so far as they may suit his purposes or may be adapted to them.

1. We must follow Pamelius in reading *contingit* (*contigit* A B Gel.); cf. the use of the present tense in the initial sentences of ch. 10 (*pertinet*), 16 (*est . . . pertinens*), and 18 (*convector*). In the sense of *pertinet*, *contingit* is found from Livy downwards (Thes. l. L. IV: 717, 26 *seqq.*). — *illorum . . . sensuum*: see the note on 14, 3. — *haereticis*: the use of *aliquid* shows that Tert. has a definite theory in mind; from §§ 13/4 it is evident that this is the view held by Marcion and other heretics, who believed the body of Christ to have been nothing but a phantom: by denying the reliability of the senses, they could pretend that whoever had seen Christ in the flesh, had been subject to an illusion.

2. For the contents of this paragraph, see the preface (p. 238). — **Academiei**: Aët. 4, 9, 2: οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας ὑγιεῖς μὲν (sc. τὰς αἰσθήσεις), οὔτε δι' αὐτῶν οἴονται λαβεῖν ἀληθινὰς φαντασίας, οὐ μὴν ἀκριβεῖς (cf. Hirzel, *Unters. zu Cic. philos. Schr.*, 3, 206₁; Heinze, *Xenokrates*, 2/3). — *durius* probably means 'rather cruelly', cf. *pud.* 1 (222, 5): *durissime nos infamantes* and *apol.* 4, 4: *dure definitis dicendo*: 'Non licet esse vos'; we may, however, also translate 'in a way rather hard to believe' (cf. the note on 28, 3). — **secundum . . . Heraclitus**: the comma should be put before *secundum*: it was generally known that the Academicians regarded the senses as unreliable, but the view of Heraclitus was open to some doubt as to its meaning; this doubt may be due to the fact that in frag. 107 (κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισιν ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἔχόντων) the restriction βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἔχόντων was overlooked (cf. also frag. 101a: ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ τῶν ὠτων ἀκριβέστεροι μάρτυρες), and that hence this statement

was regarded as contradicting frag. 55: ὅσων ὅψις ἀκοή μάθησις ('whatsoever is learned through the intermediary of sight and hearing'; Diels' translation is wrong), ταῦτα ἐγὼ προτιμέω. At any rate, the Sceptics regarded Heraclitus as an adherent of the view that the senses are unreliable, cf. Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 7, 126: τὴν . . . αἰσθησιν . . . ἀπιστον εἶναι νενόμικεν (cf. also Diog. Laërt. 9, 7: τὴν τε οἴησιν ἱερὰν νόσον εἶναι ἔλεγε καὶ τὴν ὄρασιν ψεύδεσθαι). For further particulars, see the note on 9, 5: *puto secundum quosdam et Heraclito*; Heraclitus' view about sense-perception is best described by W. Windelband, *Gesch. d. abendländ. Philos. im Altertum*, 36₄. — **Diocles**: for this physician, in whom Soranus took a special interest, see the Introduction, ch. V; his view on sense-perception is mentioned nowhere else (Wellm., *Frag. d. gr. Ärzte*, 1, 46/8 tries to reconstruct it from his theory on πνεῦμα). — **Empedocles**: Aët. 4, 9, 1: Πυθαγόρας Ἐμπεδοκλῆς . . . Πλάτων ψευδεῖς εἶναι τὰς αἰσθήσεις; cf. Witt, *Albinus*, 49/50. — The reading **pronuntians** (A) may be retained. We should not suppose the present participle to replace an indic. here (cf. the note on 1, 3), but rather regard the words *certe . . . coimplicitam* as forming part of the preceding sentence, and so put a comma after *Empedocles*; *certe* serves to introduce the last part of the sentence as in *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (340, 5/8): *quamquam quis praescientiae titulus in omnium auctore, qui universa utique <et> disponendo praesciit et praesciendo disposuit, certe (disposuit? certe all editors) ipsam transgressionem, quam nisi praescisset, nec cautionem eius delegasset sub metu mortis.* — in **Timaeo**: 28 C and 51 A *seqq.* — **sensualitatem**: Tp (also 38, 6). — **coimplicitam** (ἀ. λ.) is to be regarded as the *lectio difficilior*, and may be retained; it is also supported by the clausula (23 = 1³, which in *de anima* occurs 21 times; *complicitam* gives the very rare clausula 29). Besides, *complicare* = *adiungere*, *adnectere* is also extremely rare (in Thes. l. L. s. v. only two instances are adduced, viz. Zeno Veron. 2, 70, 3 and gramm. Lat. VII: 279, 19 Keil). — **remos**: the classic example of optical illusion since the Middle Academy: Epicur. frag. 252 Usen.; Lucr. 4, 436 *seqq.*; Cic. *Acad.* 2, 7, 19 and 25, 79; Sen. *nat. quaest.* 1, 3, 9; Aët. 3, 5, 5; Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 7, 414 and *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 119; Plut. *adv. Colot.* 25; Aristocles ap. Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 14, 20 (768 A); Synes. *de insomn.* 136 C; Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 7 (p. 188 Matth.); Aug. c. *Acad.* 3, 11, 26 and *de trin.* 15, 11, 21; Hieron. c. *Ioann. Hieros.* 35 (mostly, as in this place, in an enumeration of similar examples). — **infraetos**: 'cracked' (cf. *palmas . . . infringere* 1, 3), or simply = *fractus*, because *inflexos* precedes (similarly, in 19, 3 after *inflantur Tert.* puts *inornantur* instead of *ornantur*). — **adseverat** almost = *falso affirmat*, as is often the case in Tert. (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 23/5). The same meaning is found in Cic. *pro Cluentio* 26, 72: *et, qui esset totus ex fraude et mendacio factus, . . . pulchre asseverat se ab Oppianico destitutum* (transitional cases occur in *Phil.* 2, 32, 80 and *nat. deor.* 2, 37, 94); Tac. *ann.* 14, 16: (*doctorum sapientiae*) *contraria adseverantium discordia* (note the ironical contrast between the assurance of the assertions and their intrinsic value) and *hist.* 2, 96; Apul. *apol.* 69. Perhaps Tert. was

also influenced by the use of this verb in juridical works, cf. e. g. Ulpian. *dig.* 11, 1, 11, 3: *non . . . debuit mentiri, dum se minoris portionis heredem adseverat*; Paul. *coll. Mos.* 8, 6: *falsum est, quidquid in veritate non est, sed pro vero adseveratur*. In Tert. this meaning is frequently found, e. g. *adv. Prax.* 1 (228, 8/9); *falsa . . . adseverando*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 11 (305, 18); 2, 20 (362, 15/6); 3, 8 (389, 30); *scorp.* 10 (167, 27); *adv. Herm.* 30 (159, 1) and 42 (172, 3); *adv. Val.* 1 (177, 8); *c. Chr.* 24, 25; *ad nat.* 1, 19, 3 and 2, 11, 1; *praescr.* 33, 15. The same may be said with regard to other Christian authors, especially Arnobius, Augustine, and the Ambrosiaster. The contrast between the assurance of the assertions and their inaccuracy (cf. the passage from Tacitus just quoted) fits this verb particularly for Christian polemical purposes. — **conscientiam**: 'consciousness', a sense found since Cic. (*Thes.* I. L. IV: 368, 24 *seqq.*; of the many places from Tert. adduced there only this passage and perhaps *orat.* 22 (195, 21) really show this meaning). — **turrem**: this example is less frequently adduced than the preceding one: Sext. *Empir. adv. math.* 7, 208 and *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 118; 2, 55; Chalcid. *comm.* 237; Plut., *loc. cit.*; Lucr. 4, 353/63; Nemes. 7 (p. 187/8 Matth.); Hier., *loc. cit.*; Petron., *Anthol. Lat.* 650, 3/4. — **quadragulatam**: Tp. — **de longinquo** instead of *ab longinquo* is found for the first time in Tert. (*Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 79, 67 *seqq.*). — **porticum**: Sen. *nat. quaest.* 1, 3, 9; *benef.* 7, 1, 5; Lucr. 4, 426/31; Sext. *Empir. Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 118; Chalcid., Hier., Nemes., *loc. cit.* — **infamet**: Junius' conjecture *informet* ('= ὑποτυπῶν') is unnecessary, as Tert. very frequently uses *infamare*. The pregnant use (= *turpem videri facit*) is perfectly in keeping with the highly artificial style of the entire passage. Cf. the use of *infamare* in *iei.* 16 (296, 6/7): *licet cultu et ornatu maeroris munus infament* and *cor.* 13, 59/60: *at enim Christianus nec ianuam suam laureis infamabit* (for another possible interpretation, see the note on *fallaciae reus* in § 3). As to the sense, cf. Aug. *de ordine* 2, 11, 34: *quippe in rebus fabricatis, nulla cogente necessitate, iniqua dimensio partium facere ipsi adspectui velut quandam videtur iniuriam*. — **caelum . . . mari iungat**: as far as I know, this example is found nowhere else; perhaps it has been invented by Tert. himself (see the note on § 7). On the other hand, several examples which are frequently adduced elsewhere are omitted here, such as the changing colours of the wings of the dove (Cic. *Acad.* 2, 7, 19; 2, 25, 79; Hier., etc.), and all examples relating to movement. — **sublimitate**: see the note on 9, 1; cf. Novat. *de trin.* 1: *qui caelum alta sublimitate suspenderit* (influence of liturgical style?).

3. **fallaciae reus**: the senses are accused in due and proper form. Many expressions in this chapter belong to the same sphere of thought: § 2 *mendacium obicitur*; § 3 *arguuntur* and *depretiantur*; § 4 *onerant*; § 10 *fallaciae elogium* and *infamia liberantur*. Accordingly, it is also possible to interpret *infamet* in § 2 as equivalent to *accuset* (cf. e. g. Quint. *declam. mai.* 2, 4 = p. 23, 28 Lehnert). — **caeleste . . . plaustrum**: this is also a traditional example, as is shown by Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 12, 30, 52: *hinc . . . sonitis transeuntis vehiculi putatur ex tonitruo*

and *enchirid.* 7, 20; cf. also Hier. *de Ps.* 76 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 53, 27): *quando tonitruat Deus, similem vocem facit rotae*. — **tonitru meditante**, literally: “when thunder is preluding” = “at the first peals of thunder” (when the thunder-storm has come, every doubt is excluded). — **de plaustro . . . sonitum**: “that noise has come from a cart”. A parallel is found in *pall.* 4, 2: *de proelio sonuerat*; for the importance of this similarity, see the Introduction, p. 6*. — **posteriore quoque usu**: Karpp refers to the ninth τρόπος of Aenesidemus and adduces Sext. *Empir. Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 141 (ὁ κατὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς ἢ σπανίους συγκυρήσεις τρόπος). A better parallel is found *ib.* 2, 55: καὶ ἡ γεῦσις τὰ αὐτὰ σιτία ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν κεκορεσμένων ἀηδῆ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πεινῶντων ἡδέα φησὶν εἶναι. For the reading of *quoque* (*quaeque* is suggested by Reifferscheid), see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 58. — **depretiantur**: this verb, which belongs to the domain of the law, is very frequent in Tert.; afterwards it is only used by Christian authors. See Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 81 and Thierry, 201. — **pedibus**, etc.: Karpp compares the fifth τρόπος of Aenesidemus (ὁ παρὰ τὰς θέσεις καὶ τὰ διαστήματα καὶ τοὺς τόπους), especially the instance advanced by Sextus, *op. cit.* 1, 120: παρὰ δὲ τὰς θέσεις ὅτι ἡ αὐτὴ εἰκὼν ἐξυπτιαζομένη μὲν λεία φαίνεται, ποσῶς δὲ ἐπινευομένη εἰσοχὰς καὶ ἐξοχὰς ἔχειν δοκεῖ. A still clearer formulation occurs in *adv. mathem.* 7, 414: καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐπὶ σχήματος τὸ αὐτὸ γένος τῆς ἀπορίας εὐρήσομεν · τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ λεῖον καὶ τραχὺ ὑποπίπτει ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν γραφῶν. We find, however, no examples of this kind referring to the sense of touch. — **in lavacris**, etc.: this example is rather similar to Sext. *hypot.* 1, 110 (2, 56): καὶ ἡ τοῦ βαλανείου παραστάς τοὺς μὲν ἔξωθεν εἰσιόντας θερμαίνει, ψύχει δὲ τοὺς ἐξιόντας, εἰ ἐν αὐτῇ διατρίβοιεν. We may also refer to Plut. *adv. Colot.* 4, where in confutation of the Epicureans, who regarded all sense-perceptions as true, it is pointed out that the same wine is often called sweet by one man and sour by another, and that the same bath is cold for one, and hot for another. The Sceptics may have called attention to these facts as instances of the τρόπος παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαφωνίαν and of the τρόπος παρὰ τὰς περιστάσεις, to which also the example quoted above from *hypot.* 2, 55 refers. — **dehinc** is much more frequent in Tert. than *deinde* (in *de an.* the first word occurs eight times, the latter once; see Thierry, 188). — **sic . . . dum**: cf. 8, 2.

4. **Moderantius**: the adverb is not found before Tert. — **Stoici**: Soranus must have given a note such as *Aët.* 4, 9, 4: Οἱ Στωικοὶ τὰς μὲν αἰσθήσεις ἀληθεῖς, τῶν δὲ φαντασιῶν τὰς μὲν ἀληθεῖς, τὰς δὲ ψευδεῖς; *Cic. nat. deor.* 1, 25, 70: *Zeno . . . nonnulla visa esse falsa, non omnia*, and *Acad.* 1, 11, 41; 2, 31, 101; Sext. *adv. mathem.* 8, 355; *ib.* 185: οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς καὶ τοῦ Περιπάτου μέσσην ὁδὸν τεμόντες ἕνια μὲν ὑποκεῖσθαι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἔλεξαν ὥς ἀληθῆ, ἕνια δὲ μὴ ὑπάρχειν, ψευδομένης περὶ αὐτῶν τῆς αἰσθήσεως; see *St. V. F.* 1, 60 *seqq.* and 2, 73 *seqq.* — **onerant** = *accusant*, see 40, 4. — **Epicurei**: *Aët.* 4, 9, 5: Ἐ. πᾶσαν αἰσθησιν καὶ πᾶσαν φαντασίαν ἀληθῆ, τῶν δὲ δοξῶν τὰς μὲν ἀληθεῖς, τὰς δὲ ψευδεῖς. Cf. *Epic. ep.* 1, 50 (12, 10 *seqq.*

Usen.); *Sent.* 24 (76, 11); *Sext. Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 203 (frag. 247 Usen.) and 8, 63/4 (frag. 253). — **constantius**: 'unumwundener' Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 15), which cannot be right. According to Tert., the Epicureans are more consistent than the Stoics, as they contend that the senses possess *parem et perpetuam veritatem*; similarly, the words *alia via* only become intelligible, if we refer them to the preceding sentence: "<it is true that they, too, acknowledge the existence of the illusion,> but <they explain it> in a different way". — **Non enim sensum . . . opinionem**: according to the Epicureans, sense-perception possesses the ἐναργεία which is πάντων . . . κρηπὶς καὶ θεμέλιος (*Sext. Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 216); it never errs, because it is ἄλογος (*ib.* 7, 210; *Diog. Laërt.* 10, 31). The source of all illusions is the δόξα, which makes us suppose the oar, which in the water we perceive as broken (and which we cannot possibly perceive in a different way), to be really broken. The best exposition of this theory is given by Sextus, *op. cit.*, 204/12; cf. also *Lucr.* 4, 462/8: *cetera de genere hoc mirande multa videmus, [quae violare fidem quasi sensibus omnia quaerunt, | nequiquam, quoniam pars horum maxima fallit | propter opinatus animi quos addimus ipsi, | pro visis ut sint quae non sunt sensibu] visa. | Nam nil aegrius est quam res discernere apertas | ab dubiis, animus quas ab se protinus addit; ib.* 379/86 and 500 seqq.; *Epic. frag.* 248/54 Usen.; Robin's note on *Lucr.* 4, 379. — **Sensum . . . pati**, viz. because it is ἄλογος (see the preceding note). — **Absciderunt . . . ab anima**: it is for this reason that Tert. rejects this theory as well, though on the whole it was quite acceptable to him: he felt his own belief in the unity of the soul endangered by it, as is shown by the choice of *absciderunt*, a very strong term. Besides, he certainly did not wish to owe anything to the *Epicuri stupor* (3, 2). So he modified the latter's theory so as to declare that the *causae fallunt sensus et per sensus opinionones* (§ 8): everything takes place with inevitable necessity, the *opinio* is completely dependent on the senses, for *nisi visus rotundam senserit turrem, nulla opinio rotunditatis* (this is another reason why a strong influence of the Stoics on Tert. in this chapter is not very probable: the Stoics regarded the φαντασία καταληπτική as not always necessary; see e. g. Überweg-Prächter, 417/8). If sense-perception is represented in this way, it is impossible to speak of illusions, and this is the very result which Tert. wishes to arrive at. Of course the whole discussion is hardly more than a play upon words, for the *opinio* described by Tert. does not correspond to the δόξα meant by the Epicureans: the *opinio rotunditatis* mentioned in § 5 is the erroneous opinion that the tower is round; this opinion is neutralized as soon as the special causes to which the illusion is due, are taken into account, whereas the δόξα meant by the Epicureans is capable by itself of correcting the inaccurate representation of the object caused by perception; in other words, Tert. separates the true opinion, which takes the causes into account, from the *opinio*. — **animam . . . opinari**: the expression may have been influenced by *Lucr.* 4, 465: *propter opinatus animi* (of course the use of *animus* is impossible for Tert.; see the preface to ch. 12); the Greek sources only mention the δόξα here.

5. **Et unde**: see the note on 7, 2: *et quid*. — **unde opinio, si non a sensu**: Lucr. 4, 482/4 (*quid maiore fide porro quam sensus haberi / debet? an a b sensu falso ratio orta valebit / dicere eos contra, quae tota ab sensibus orta est?*) shows that the *opinio* meant here by Tert. corresponds to the $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ of the Epicureans. The statement *unde . . . sensu?* serves as a proof for the assertion that *sensus* and *opinio* cannot be separated from each other; cf. 18, 13: *per quod enim quid est, cum ipso est*. — **Denique . . . rotunditatis**: see the comm. on § 4. — **renuntiari**: cf. 6, 4/5 — The reading *per id* must be retained. In the first edition I followed a suggestion by Professor F. Muller and wrote *id* on the ground of parallelism (*porro si potest id renuntiari . . . cur non perinde possit [per] id renuntiari*); however, the point is that this sentence contains a conclusion *per analogiam*: “If something, which is not present in the objects (for instance the apparent curve of the oar), can be communicated <by the senses>, why can it not be equally well be communicated by a factor which is not present in the senses, but in special causes (in this case the water)?” *Per id* is clearly supported by *interveniant*.

6. **recognosci**: this verb is frequently used at the end of a sentence instead of *cognoscere* for the sake of the clausula (also 21, 1; 23, 4; 26, 2; 28, 4; 28, 5; 31, 5; 46, 5; 53, 6); cf. Hyltén, 87/8. — **in causa est**, almost = *causa est*, occurs since Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 1, 1, 1 (Thes. I. L. III: 670, 60 *seqq.*); for Tert., see Löfst., *Apol.*, 114 and Waltz., *Ét.*, 342. — **aqua in causa est**: the explanation of the Epicureans; cf. Aug. c. *Acad.* 3, 11, 26: *Restat, ut quaeratur, utrum, cum ipsi (sc. sensus) renuntiant, verum renuntient. Age, si dicat Epicureus quispiam, nihil habeo quod de sensibus conquerar. Iniustum est enim ab eis exigere plus quam possunt: quidquid autem possunt videre oculi, verum vident. Ergone verum est quod de remo in aqua vident? Prorsus verum. Nam causa accedente quare ita videretur, si demersus unda remus rectus appareret, magis oculos meos falsae renuntiationis arguerem* (cf. Tert. § 10 *ex.*). *Non enim viderent quod talibus existentibus causis videndum fuit. Quid multis opus est? Hoc de turrium motu, hoc de pinniculis avium, hoc de ceteris innumerabilibus dici potest. Ego tamen fallor, si assentior, ait quispiam. Noli plus assentiri, quam ut tibi apparere persuadeas, et nulla deceptio est.* (similarly, *de vera relig.* 33, 62). — **Teneritas . . . recti**: the meaning is mainly clear: the image proceeding from the object ‘vibrates’; on account of this vibration, whatever in the object is straight, appears as curved or broken. This is the Epicurean theory, as already shown by the use of *imago* ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\nu$); cf. Plut. *adv. Colot.* 25: τῶν λεγόντων καμπυλοειδῆ φαντασίαν λαμβάνειν, εἰ δὲ καμπύλον ἐστὶ, μὴ προσαποφαίνεσθαι τὴν ὄψιν, μὴδ’ ὅτι στρογγύλον, ἀλλ’ ὅτι φάντασμα περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τύπωμα στρογγυλοειδὲς γέγονε. The words *teneritas . . . substantiae . . . qua speculum ex lumine efficitur* must needs refer to the water (cf. the preceding sentence: *ut in aqua remus inflexus vel infractus appareat, aqua in causa est*). “Water is a very subtle essence, which is quite easily moved <; practically it is always in motion.> It modifies the image which has started from the

object during its passage by transmitting its own movement to it; on account of this the image gets into vibration, etc.". The rightness of this interpretation is also proved by the next sentence: *Item ut turris habitus eludat, intervalli condicio compellit in aperto*. An explanation as given here is found nowhere else; the most plausible solution seems to be that Tert. found the Epicurean view (*aqua in causa est*) in his source, and added a further explanation of his own finding (cf. the comm. on the next sentence). The words *teneritas . . . qua speculum ex lumine efficitur*, too, need not contain more than an *argumentum ex sensu communi*: "the subtlety of water is proved by the fact that, when shone upon by the light, it acts like a mirror". — in *aperto*: 'obviously'; this expression (since Sall. *Iug.* 5, 3; cf. Thes. l. l. II: 224, 9/14) seems to occur as an adverb only in this place and in *apol.* 9, 1. — *luce vestiens*: a poetical phrase perfectly in keeping with the style of the description of the present examples (§§ 2/3) and their explanation (§ 6); for more details, see my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 203: *flos alium laetus suo lumine vestit* (= *vestitur*) *amictum*. To the passages quoted there may be added *Apul. de mundo* 3 (139, 19/20 Thom.): *sinceriore interdum luce vestitur*; *Mart. Montani et Lucii* 4, 2; *Caesar. Arelat. serm.* 188, 1. 199, 7. 227, 6 *Morin*; *Mar. Victorin. ad ep. ad Philipp.* 2, 5 (P. L. 8, 1206 D); *Ambros. hymn.* 2, 2/3; *Od. Salom.* 11, 11; 21, 3; 25, 8 (cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 303₂); the inscription from Komarios quoted by *Wetter, Charis*, 132: ἐνδύονται φῶς καὶ δόξαν θείαν; cf. also *Kroll, de orac. Chald.*, 51, and from modern literature e. g. *Petrarca, sonn.*, 9, 3/4. — *Item*, etc.: in this case too the Epicureans assumed a modification of the image by the medium. The clearest description of their explanation is given by *Sext. Empir. adv. math.* 7, 208/9: οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμι (viz. as does Epicure) ψεύδεσθαι τὴν ὄψιν, ὅτι ἐκ μακροῦ μὲν διαστήματος μικρὸν ὄρα τὸν πύργον καὶ στρογγύλον, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ συνεγγυς μείζονα καὶ τετράγωνον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύειν, ὅτι καὶ ὅτε φαίνεται μικρὸν αὐτῇ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ τοιουτόσχημον, ὅντως ἐστὶ μικρὸν καὶ τοιουτόσχημον, τῇ διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος φορᾶ ἀποθραυσόμενων τῶν κατὰ τὰ εἰδῶλα περᾶτων; cf. also *Lucr.* 4, 353/9: *quadratasque procul turris cum cernimus urbis, / propterea fit uti videantur saepe rutundae, / angulus optus quia longe cernitur omnis, / sive etiam potius non cernitur ac perit eius / plaga, nec ad nostras acies perlabitur ictus, / aera per multum quia dum simulacra feruntur, / cogit hebescere eum crebris offensibus aer*. Tert.'s explanation (if it does deserve this name) is different. At first he still follows Epicurus in declaring the illusion to be due to the medium (*intervalli condicio*, *Sext.* τῇ διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος φορᾶ, *Lucr.* *aera per multum*), but in his further explanation he speaks of the *aequalitas circumfusi aeris*, where to *circumfusi* we should supply *turri*, not *simulacro* (*speculo*): the words *pari luce vestiens angulos* clearly require this interpretation (*Lucr.*: *angulus optus quia longe cernitur omnis* also means the *angulus turris*, not the κατὰ τὰ εἰδῶλα πέρατα mentioned by *Sextus*; the same applies to *Petron.* (*Anthol. Lat.* 650, 3/4): *Nam turris, prope quae quadrata surgit, / detritis procul*

angulis rotatur). So the meaning is: "the air surrounding the tower blurs the outlines". Though it is possible that Tert. here imitates Lucr. 4, 355 (*angulus . . . omnis*) without caring for the motivation given there or that he found in Soranus an expression such as ἀποθραυσμένων τῶν περάτων and refers to the tower what should be referred to the images, it is more plausible that once more he gives a popular explanation (cf. *aequalitas* and *pari luce*: 'even light'). — The explanations of the two remaining cases are of an entirely different order, as they are not based on the object or its image, but on the perceiving subject. For the Epicureans a reference to the weakness of sight would have been equivalent to an annulment of the fundamental reliability of the senses; Tert. completely overlooks the fact that an explanation which contains the words *ubi visio absumitur* is quite contrary to this view. The explanation given by him seems to have originated from the Sceptics (for Philo of Larissa, see Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skeptiz.*, 113; cf. Sext. *Emp. adv. mathem.* 7, 171. 183. 195). Afterwards it was almost certainly borrowed from them by the younger Stoics for their polemics against the Epicureans; see Jaeger, *loc. cit.*, 44₁ and Gronau, *Poseidonius*, 15₁, according to whom Posidonius took this argument from the adherents of the Middle Academy and transmitted it to the Stoics and Platonists of the Christian period. Cf. e. g. Chalcid. *comm.* 237: *ex obliquo visa porticus in exile deficit oculorum depravatione*; *ib.*: *oneraria quippe navis eminus visa perexigua apparet deficiente contemplationis vigore*; Basil. *hexam.* 6, 9: τῆς ὁρατικῆς δυνάμεως οὐκ ἐξικνουμένης τὸν μεταξὺ τόπον διαπερᾶν; *ib.* δι' ἀτονίαν (sc. τῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ). According to the Stoic theory, the ὁρατικὴ δύναμις, which spreads from the eye as a material emanation and has a conical shape, must be limited by nature (Chalcid.: *Quodque omnis natura modo mensuraque moveatur, spatii quoque magnitudinisque conici modum fore, eaque re neque valde adplicata visui nec nimium distantia visibilia clare videri*); consequently, it focuses the images of all distant objects (Chalcid.: *sic etiam . . . ipse sol. . . intra bipedalis diametri ambitum cernitur*; Sen. *nat. quaest.* 1, 3, 10: *hunc* (sc. solem) *acies nostra . . . contraxit*; Plotin. 2, 8, 1). It is in this way that we should understand the words *illic tenuatur, quo et extenditur*; by *acies . . . in concluso stipata* Tert. obviously means the same thing: "sight is compressed into one point" (so *in* is followed by an ablat. instead of an accus., as is often the case in Tert.'s works, cf. e. g. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 23/30). — *unitur*: this verb is used for the first time by Seneca (*nat. quaest.* 2, 2, 4), who, however, declares that he wishes to avoid this very word; it has always remained extremely rare. — *ubi visio absumitur*: exactly the same idea is found in Basil., *loc. cit.*: ἐνδapaνηθεῖσα τῷ ἄερι ἡ ὄψις.

7. Whereas for the discussion in the preceding paragraph we could adduce some parallels, this is impossible here. In all three cases we find remarks which do not deserve to be regarded as serious refutations. A Sceptic would of course point out that both the illusion caused by the similarity of sounds and the fact that *ferme prima vis tota est*

are strong arguments for the unreliability of the senses. Though it is not altogether out of the question that the Epicureans referred to the first-mentioned case as an instance of the illusion by the δόξα, we are justified in supposing that Tert. for these less important cases invented an explanation himself.

8. A recapitulation of §§ 4/7: neither the senses nor the opinions err. — **sequentibus causas**: Tert., as is often the case, in his final conclusion wants to say everything as explicitly as possible; it is from this point of view that the numerous repetitions felt by us as perfectly superfluous are to be understood. Besides, Tert.'s circumstantiality may partly be due to his having been a lawyer (cf. such passages as *eum loco, in quo loco*, etc.). Many relevant passages have been collected by Thornëll (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 73/82), to which may be added *res.* 32 (71, 17/9): *aut si in hominem destinatur, necesse est in eas substantias destinetur, ex quibus homo structus est, in quem destinatur; fuga* 2, 1: *si, quod iniquitas a deo non est, sed a diabolo, persecutio autem ex iniquitate consistit, . . . ideo videtur persecutio a diabolo evenire, a quo iniquitas agitur ex qua constat persecutio.*

9. The illusions of madmen and of sick people had also been adduced by the Sceptics as arguments for the unreliability of the senses (Sext. *Empir. Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 44 and *adv. mathem.* 7, 198: jaundice; *ib.* 7, 170; 244/5; 249: insanity; Orestes quoted as an example). In confutation of this view the Epicureans argued that in this case "perfectly real images, bodies, and shapes come from the surrounding air" (Plut. *adv. Colot.* 28). Tert. admits the existence of illusions here, but only indicates the causes, viz. insanity and illness, to which these illusions are due; however, in the case of the oar he followed the Epicureans in ruling out the possibility of an illusion. It is this very inconsistency which strongly supports the supposition that most of the explanations given in this chapter should be ascribed to Tert. himself. — **Orestes**: the classic example of madness, frequently adduced by the Sceptics in their polemics against other philosophical schools (cf. e. g. Plut., *loc. cit.*, Sext., *loc. cit.*, Aët. 4, 12, 5/6). Cic. (*Tusc.* 3, 5, 11) in this context mentions Athamas, Alcmaeon, Ajax, and Orestes, Plut. *de superst.* 5 (167 C), Athamas and Agaue. — **Qui** instead of *iis qui* (or rather *si qui*); see the note on 9, 1. — **auruginant** (ἰκτερίῳσι; cf. Sext.) is a ζ. λ.; for *praevaricationem*, cf. 1, 6. — **evertuntur . . . ad tempus**: the illusion lasts as long as the *causae* are at work; hence it is wrong to regard it as inherent in the senses.

10. **elogium** = *crimen*. Originally *elogium* means "der Bericht, mit welchem ein ergriffener Verbrecher der zuständigen Gerichtsbehörde überwiesen wird, eine Art Anklageschrift" (Beck, 126₁); for more details, see A. von Premerstein, R. E. V: 2440/52, especially 2451/52; Mommsen, *Rom. Strafrecht*, 309₆ ("Tatbestandsaufnahme"); H. Krüger, A. L. L. 10, 251/2. Cf. e. g. Modestin. *dig.* 49, 16, 3: *desertorem auditum ad suum ducem cum elogio praeses mittet*. It seems advisable to follow

Waltz., *comm.*, 26, in distinguishing the following meanings of this word in Tert. (apart from the sense 'an inscription doing homage to somebody', which occurs in *apol.* 50, 11): a) the record sent to the authorities (*Scap.* 4; *scorp.* 15 = 178,6), which contained data about the person of the offender, hence 'name', 'denomination', e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (348, 3/4): *sed et si [non] ab homine in diabolum transcripseris mali elogium* (the denomination 'the Evil One'); *ib.* 1, 22 (320, 2/3): *totum . . . creatoris elogium* (the (evil) name 'Creator'); b) the qualification of the crime, *titulus criminis*, mostly followed by a genit., e. g. *cor.* 5, 34/5: *elogium sacrilegii*; *mon.* 9; *adv. Marc.* 3, 13 (398, 21); *res.* 4 (30, 9) and 34 (73, 20); *scorp.* 8 (160, 18); *apol.* 24, 6; *pud.* 4 (225, 22); c) the charge or the crime itself (of course it is not always possible to make a clear distinction between the two last-mentioned meanings), e. g. *apol.* 2, 4 *de nostris elogiis* ("our infamous deeds"); 15, 2; 44, 2; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 45; see also Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 715. — *ratione* is here used intentionally for *causa*, as a 'rational cause' is not apt to be called 'fallacious'. — *Quod sic fieri oportet*: passages like this one show a transition to the use of *oportere* as a personal verb, which use becomes common in the fifth century after Christ (see e. g. Norberg, 2, 183 seq.). Cf. also *bapt.* 18, 2: *sic oportebat deprehendi, cui ultro deus apostolum miserat* and *an.* 44, 3: *si (id) non somnium magis credi oporteret*. A personal use of this verb is assumed by Borleffs in *bapt.* 16, 2: *quia . . . qui aqua lavissent, et sanguine oporterent* (sc. *lavare*; *sanguine* * *porterent* T; *sanguinem portarent* B; the last-mentioned reading is defended by Dölger, *A Ch* 2 (1930), 119 seq.). — *liberantur* = *absolvuntur*, a meaning frequently found in Tert. (see Oehler's note on c. *Chr.* 7; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 82; Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 32; for *paen.* 3, 12, see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 79). — *hinc . . . quod*: see for this combination Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 84; Mossberg, 36; Engelbrecht, *Claud. Mam.*, 42. — *quam quod illa ratio mandavit*: there is no reason to follow Oehler in excising *quod*, as this word is once more used in the sense of *sicut* (cf. 10, 6). A striking parallel is found in Jordan. *Get.* 5, 38 (64, 3 Mommsen; cf. Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 14 seq.): *aliter . . . quam quod nos diximus*.

11. The indispensability of the senses for human life together with the assertion that life would be impossible, if they were untrustworthy, has always been an essential element of the polemics against the Sceptics; here too the Epicureans seem to have been protagonists (see the passage from Lucretius adduced in the preface to this chapter; for Diogenes of Oinoanda, see Bignone, *L'Aristotele perduto et la formazione filosofica di Epicuro* (Florence 1936), 1, 18 seq.); for more details, see e. g. Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skept.*, 27 (Timon); 94 (Clitomachus); 110 (Antipater); for the attitude of the later Sceptics, cf. Sext. *Pyrrhon. hypot.* 1, 23 and 226. Especially the discussion found in Cic. *Acad.* 2, 10, 31 is very similar to the present passage: *istam κατάληψιν . . . cum ipsa per se amat* (sc. *mens hominis*) — *nihil est enim ei veritatis luce dulcius — tum etiam propter usum. quocirca et sensibus utitur, et artes efficit, quasi sensus alteros*

(Tert.: *secunda . . . instructio . . . , tot artes, etc.*); *et usque eo philosophiam ipsam corroborat, ut virtutem efficiat, ex qua re una vita omnis apta sit. ergo hi, qui negant quidquam posse comprehendere, haec ipsa eripiunt vel instrumenta, vel ornamenta vitae; vel potius etiam totam vitam evertunt funditus, ipsumque animal orbant animo*; cf. also Maxim. Tyr. diss. 36, 1/3. — **Academia** (A; *Academic* B Gel.) should certainly be retained; cf. Cic. Acad. 2, 32, 103: *errare eos qui dicant ab Academia sensus eripi*, where Schiche's conjecture *Academicis* is equally superfluous (see Plasberg's note and Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 138₁). — **Quid agis**: a similar personification occurs in *pud.* 5 (227, 25/6): *quid agis, molliissima et humanissima disciplina?* — **Totum . . . evertis**: cf. the passage from Cic. and cor. 5, 4/6 (I give Oehler's text): *puto autem naturae deus noster est, qui figuravit hominem et fructibus rerum appetendis, iudicandis, consequendis certos in eo sensus ordinavit per propria membrorum quodammodo organa*. The dative of the gerundive joined to *praeficere* also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 13) and *pat.* 6 (10, 17). — **incolendis** should not be changed in *colendis* (Reiff.), as is shown by *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 6/7): *quis denique dignus incolere dei opera quam ipsius imago et similitudo?* and *res.* 9 (37, 25/6): (*anima*) *quam incolatui fructui dominatui totius suae operationis praeposuit* (sc. *deus*; this passage was imitated by the author of [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 17 = 187, 15/6 Batiff.-Wilm.). — **secunda . . . instructio**: this expression becomes clear by comparing Cic., *loc. cit.*: *artes . . . quasi sensus alteros*. The same idea underlies such statements as Epic. *sent.* 20: ἡ διάνοια . . . τὸν παντελῆ βίον παρεσκεύασεν; [Arist.] *de mundo* 6 (399b 15/6): πᾶς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ βίου διάκοσμος ὑπὸ ταύτης (sc. τῆς τέχνης) εὐρεῖται. This passage was imitated by Tert. himself in *res.* 7 (36, 7/15): *quem enim naturae usum, quem mundi fructum, quem elementorum saporem non per carnem anima depascitur? quidni? per quam omni instrumento sensuum fulciatur, visu auditu gustu odoratu contactu? . . . artes per carnem, studia ingenia per carnem, opera negotia officia per carnem, atque adeo totum vivere animae carnis est*. Cf. also Hier. *ad Ephes.* 5, 28: *amabimus nostrum corpus et corporis sensus, vilioris quidem conditionis ab animo, sed per quos ad mentem bonarum artium et virtutum transeant disciplinae*. With this enumeration of substantives, which may best be divided into four groups (*artes ingenia — studia negotia officia — commercia remedia consilia solacia — victus cultus ornatus*) cf. *ad nat.* 1, 10, 6: *in negotiis, in officiis; res.* 7 (36, 13/4): *opera negotia officia; pud.* 19 (265, 19); *ux.* 2, 4, etc. — **ornatus, quae omnia**: it is not quite impossible to retain the reading given by A (*ornatusque omnia*), if we follow Reifferscheid in putting a question-mark after *omnia*, and regard this as equivalent to *denique omnia*, a meaning rather frequently found at the end of enumerations (cf. the literature quoted by Axelsson, *Neue Senecastudien*, 215₃₇; we may add Fronto p. 28 Naber: ο ἐπιχειρήματα, ο τάξεις, ο elegantia, ο lepus, . . . ο omnia; for *et omnia* = *et cetera omnia*, see Tidn., *De partic. copulat.*, 2₁ and Lyngby, 6). On the other hand, in this case the next sentence begins rather abruptly, whereas *quae omnia* is fairly frequent in Tert. at the beginning of relative clauses, e. g. 23, 6;

39, 1; *adv. Marc.* 3, 22 (416, 17/8): *gloriae . . . relatio et benedictio et laus et hymni quae omnia (hymni. quae Kroymann)*. — *homo . . . capax*: the well-known Stoic definition (ascribed to Chrysippus by Plut. *moral.* 450 D; similar definitions are already found in [Plato] *defin.* 415 A and Aristot. *top.* 133b 2): *ἄνθρωπός ἐστι ζῷον λογικὸν θνητόν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν* (Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 269); it is also quoted in *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 25/6) and *test. anim.* 1 (135, 19/20), whereas the shorter form of the formula (which is much more common) occurs in *c. Chr.* 12, 18/9: *hominem, animal solum rationale* and *adv. Prax.* 5 (234, 1/2). Many other instances from Christian authors have been collected by Schwartz in his index to Tatianus, pp. 64/5; Geffcken, *Zw. griech. Apol.*, 243₂; Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes*, 99₁; Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 164₂. — *dinoseitur*: it is not quite certain whether the pleonastic use of this verb so common in later centuries is to be assumed here (the first instance seems to be found in Apul. *Asclep.* 1; cf. Svenn., *Pallad.*, 456. 647; Elg, 83₁; Norberg, 1, 29 *seqq.*; Juret, *Filastr.*, 120; Stangl, *Pseudoascon.*, 153; Löfst., *Per.*, 210 *seqq.*; Armini, *Eran.* 23 (1925), 159; Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1221, 50 *seqq.*; for medieval Latin, see Strecker, *Einführung in das Mittel-latein*, 26/7). At all events, one of the factors to which this use is due, viz. the wish to get a good clausula (see Svenn., *op. cit.*, 456), is already evident in this place. The words *et ipsius Academiae* contain a malicious addition by Tert.

12. *testimonium . . . signet*: as far as I know, this expression is found nowhere else; the usual expression *testimonium reddere* occurs in *apol.* 14, 8 and 46, 6 (both times in connection with Socrates) and in *Scap.* 4; *t. perhibere* occurs in *apol.* 10, 4. — in *Phaedro*: 229 E: οὐ δύναμαι πω κατὰ τὸ Δελφικὸν γράμμα γινῶναι ἑμαυτὸν γελοῖον δὴ μοι φαίνεται τοῦτο ἔτι ἀγνοοῦντα τὰ ἀλλότρια σκοπεῖν. — *ex Socratis persona*: according to Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.* 1, 112, the connection of *ex persona* with a genit. may be due to the example of such scriptural passages as 2 Cor. 1, 11: *ut ex multorum personis . . . per multos gratiae agantur pro nobis* (ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων), though (as they also observe) several instances may be quoted from pagan authors, e. g. Cic. *inv.* 1, 52, 99: *ex tua persona enumerare possis* (cf. also Seyffert-Müller, *Cic. Laelius*, 524/5); on the other hand, Merckx (p. 50), who refers to Vellei 1, 3, 2. 3, Justin. 3, 7, 14, Gell. 10, 22, 1 and 10, 24, and Ps.-Ascon. 134, 3, supposes that this expression does not belong to Christian Latinity. However, as it becomes much more frequent in the works of Christian authors, we are certainly justified in regarding it as a 'mediate Christianity'. In the case of many authors we must reckon with the influence of the Greek, where ἐκ προσώπου is also used more frequently since the New Testament (in pagan literature e. g. Lucian. *Nigrin.* 11: ἀπὸ γυμνοῦ σοι βούλομαι τοῦμοῦ προσώπου προσλαλεῖν; Diog. Laërt. 6, 101 in the list of works of Menippus mentions ἐπιστολαὶ κεκομψυμέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν θεῶν προσώπου). Cf. Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 503; Friebel, 42; Goelz, *Jér.*, 264; M. V. Brown, *The syntax of the prepositions in the works of saint Hilary* (Washington 1934), 111.

Besides *ex p.* we find *sub p.* in *bapt.* 12, 8 and *res.* 36 (78, 3); this expression is rather frequent in Christian literature since Lactant.; in pagan literature, as far as I know, it occurs only in Serv. *ad Verg. bucol.* 6, 13. Much rarer are *in p.* (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (348, 18. 349, 15); 3, 7 (387, 19); Hier. *in Abd.* 1, 2/3. 19; *tract. de Ps.* 7. 111; *Alterc. Simon et Theophili* p. 36, 13/4; Rufin-Gregor. *Naz. orat.* 5, 17, 2) and *a p.* (Iren. 3, 6, 2). For more details, see S. Schlossmann, *Persona und πρόσωπον im Recht und im christl. Dogma* (Kiel 1906); O. Hey, A. L. L. 15, 147/9; H. Rheinfelder, *Das Wort 'Persona'* (Halle 1928). — **Delphica inscriptio**: cf. *apol.* 48, 9: *Tu, homo, tantum nomen, si intellegas te vel de titulo Pythiae discens.* — in **Theaeteto**: 150 C. According to the anonymous commentary on the Theaetetus *ad loc.*, several people regarded Plato as Ἀχαθημαίχων . . . ὥς οὐδὲν δογματίζοντα. — **scire atque sentire**: for the use of the infin. as a subst., see the comm. on ch. 4. — in **Phaedro**: this may refer to the description of the immediate contemplation of the 'Forms' in the ὑπερουράνιος τόπος (247 D/E). — **sententiam veritatis, postumam scilicet**: the punctuation given by Oehler and Reifferscheid (*sent., ver. post. scil.*) is certainly wrong, as the combination *veritatis postumam* makes no sense at all (though it is true that a genit. is found after *postumus* in *apol.* 40, 6 and *ad nat.* 1, 9, 8; for Prud. *Hamart.* 607, see Bergmann, *Eran.* 12 (1912), 141/2). The genit. has the function of an adjunct.; cf. 28, 2: *de adytis fallaciae* and 43, 12: *naturam immortalitatis*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 395; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 19/20. A similar use of the genit. *veritatis* is found in Iren. 5, 1, 2: *putative . . . in substantia veritatis*; Amm. Marc. 27, 9, 9: *iustisque veritatis suffragiis*.

13. **Non licet, non licet**: this pathetic repetition should certainly be retained, as Tert. in this paragraph discloses the real motive of his argument. For more instances, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 74/5. Cf. especially such polemical passages as *res.* 9 (37, 29): *absit, absit, ut . . .*; *adv. Prax.* 29 (285, 7): *obmutescat, obmutescat ista blasphemia*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 27 (329, 7); *pud.* 1 (220, 12); *ad ux.* 2, 8: *non licet aliter fidelibus nubere, non expedit.* — **devocare** (A), **not revocare** is the correct reading; the expression *in dubium devocare* is also found in Caes. *bell. Gall.* 6, 7, 6 and Ulp. *dig.* 37, 10, 1, 11, so Tert. may have borrowed it from the idiom of lawyers. Cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (302, 18): *ad probationem devocantur.* — *istos* = *hos*, cf. 1, 1. — **deliberetur** almost = **dubitetur**, as in *idol.* 4 (34, 10); Sall. *or. Phil.* 3; Min. Fel. 35, 4; Mart. Cap. 5, 448; Non. Marc. p. 282: *deliberare est dubitare.* For Tert.'s use of **quod** with a subjunctive instead of an accus. cum infin. (in *de anim.* it occurs eleven times), see S. Mayen, *De particulis quod quia quoniam*, etc. (Kiel 1889), 47; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 75/6. — **alium . . . spiritum**: this instance refers to § 3: *siquidem . . . depretiantur* (for each of the five senses Tert. has sought a suitable scriptural text).

14. The last-mentioned example constitutes a perfectly natural transition to a discussion of Marcion's view, as the scriptural text to

which Tert. alluded there (Luc. 22, 19/20) plays an important part in his more elaborate refutation of Marcion's assertion that the body of Christ should have been no more than a phantom; cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (560, 13 *seqq.*): *sic et in calicis mentione testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum substantiam corporis confirmavit. nullius enim corporis sanguis potest esse nisi carnis . . . ita consistet . . . probatio carnis de testimonio sanguinis* and 5, 8 (597, 21/3): *proinde panis et calicis sacramento iam in evangelio probavimus corporis et sanguinis dominici veritatem adversus phantasma Marcionis*. For the change introduced by Marcion into the text of this scriptural passage, see Harnack, *Marcion*, 233*, for his interpretation, *ib.* 305*. The most important discussion of this subject by Tert. is found in *adv. Marc.* 3, 8/11; cf. also *ib.* 1, 22 (318, 21/2); 3, 15 (401, 27); 3, 24 (422, 20/1); 4, 8 (438, 10); 4, 9; 4, 18 (480, 16); 4, 20 (487, 24); 4, 40; 4, 42; 5, 20 (647, 23); *adv. Prax.* 15 (255, 1/2); *c. Chr.* 1, 14 and 5, 9/10; *res.* 2 (26, 17/8); Harnack, *op. cit.*, 286*/7*; 360*/1*; d'Alès, *Théol.*, 367; Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 110/1. To the passages collected by Harnack may be added Ambrosiaster in 1 *Cor.* 1, 2 and [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 72 (407 D). The most important changes introduced by Marcion were the reading φάντασμα instead of πνεῦμα in Luc. 24, 37 and the excision of 24, 40 (Harnack, 239* and 247*). — *Iudificata*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 20 (648, 15/8): *colluctationis* (sc. mortis crucis) *quam imaginariam in phantasmate scisset* (sc. dominus), *frustrato potius eam quam experto nec virtute functo in passione sed l u s u*. The verb seems to have active sense = *videntes elusit*. However, a passive meaning is not quite impossible ("was shown as an illusion"); this use of the word would be an archaism (-are Cic. *pro Quinctio* 54, -ari already in *Rosc. Amerin.* 55; cf. Hellmuth, 118/9. 129). — *ante*: Tert. avoids *antea* (Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 88/9). — *fidelis* . . . *Thomae*: Methodius (*resurr.* 3, 12, 5/6; cf. 1, 52, 3; 2, 18, 8; 3, 5, 4) also quotes this story as an argument for the reality of the body of Christ; cf. also Rufin.-Adamant. 5, 6: *et rursum post resurrectionem contrectandum se dubitanti discipulo praebuit. numquid nam per fraudem volebat proprios discipulos illudere, ut vellet eis persuadere carnem esse in se et ossa, quod non erat?* The most important passage from Tert. in this connection is *c. Chr.* 5, 58/71. — *quod* . . . *vitae*: in the quotation of 1 *Ioh.* 1, 1 the first four words ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς have been replaced by *quod vidimus*, and ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα after ὁφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν has been omitted; the same is found in *adv. Prax.* 15 (254, 8/10; the *frag. Murator.* 29 has *quae vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audivimus et manus nostrae palpaverunt*). Tert. has altered the structure of the sentence in omitting to translate ὃ before ἐωράκαμεν, and so puts *vidimus* and *contrectaverunt* in the principal sentence (cf. Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 721). Cf. the interpretation of this passage by Clem. Alex. *frag.* 24 (III: 210, 8 *seqq.* Staehlin): *non solum carnem eius, sed etiam virtutes eiusdem filii significat* and Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 2 *seqq.*

18. *The mind should not be separated from the senses.*

"We shall now discuss the mind which, according to Plato and the heretics who followed him, is completely independent of the body (§§ 1/2). Knowledge, Plato argues, is obtained through the powers of the soul only; its objects, the 'Forms', are unattainable for the senses, which form part of the body (§ 3). It is by this argument that he enables the Gnostics, especially the Valentinians, to separate the senses and the mind from each other; they refer to this separation by means of an allegorical interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins (§ 4). To the 'spirituals' they attribute a higher kind of sense, viz. intellectual cognition, which is capable of grasping higher and invisible objects, whereas to the 'psychics' they only ascribe sense-perception, which cannot attain any more than visible and transitory things. However, for the purpose of refuting such theories, I have already pointed out that both *anima* and *spiritus* are entirely inherent in the soul (of course an exception is to be made for the *spiritus dei* and the *spiritus diaboli*, which are *accidentia*) (§ 5). <The unity of the soul is not affected by the plurality of its forms of knowledge, for> the only difference to be stated here bears upon the objects; when one class of them is grasped by the senses, and the other by the mind, both of them are eventually known by the soul itself. Besides, perception and intellectual cognition are fundamentally one and the same thing (§§ 6/7), so that their seats, viz. *anima* and *animus*, cannot possibly be different (§ 8a). If these two powers were really different, they would leave each other at times, when either of them is performing its own task. However, this never happens: the *animus* is inseparable from the soul (§§ 8b/10a). As far as I am concerned, the mind may be regarded as more important than the senses; only this preference should not lead us to the belief that the mind is a completely isolated essence, for in this case I must also reject this preference, which might induce us to follow Marcion in assuming the existence of some higher God (§ 10b). It is rather the objects of the mind that are of a higher order; the mind itself cannot have such a dominating position, as it owes its very knowledge to the senses (§ 11): for it is the images that make us know the reality lying behind them, as is stated by both St. Paul and Plato; so it is evident that the senses are the guides of the mind (§ 12).

Thus we arrive at the conclusion that the mind is neither of a higher order than the senses nor separable from them (§ 13)".

The structure of this chapter is very similar to that of the preceding one; here again it is the wish to refute the heretics which lies at the root of the whole discussion; here, too, a rather detailed exposition of the contrary view is followed by the refutation, which also concludes with a quotation from Holy Scripture.

In the refutation (§§ 6/13) three parts are to be distinguished. 1) In ch. 12 the mind was proved to be inherent in the soul, and so the differentiation of *sensualia* and *intellectualia* can only refer to the objects, which are made known to the soul through the intermediary

of the senses and of the mind (§ 6). 2) Next a still closer connection between *sensus* and *intellectus* is brought about by the demonstration (which demonstration, however, is based on apparent reasons only) of the identity of sense-perception and intellectual cognition. This leads to the conclusion that the seats of these two powers, the soul (which quite unexpectedly is mentioned here as the seat of sense-perception) and the mind, are by no means to be regarded as two separate substances, as they have the same functions and never leave each other; a most unusual explanation of insanity furnishes an additional proof. The conclusion, like the last-mentioned digression, shows quite clearly which view Tert. really adheres to among these overstated assertions: the *animus* is a *vis animae* and is always present in the soul (he omits to point out explicitly that it is this fact which invalidates the distinction between 'spirituals' and 'psychics' assumed by the Valentinians). The mind may be of a higher order than the senses, only we should guard against regarding it as an isolated power (§§ 7/10). 3) Next Tert. argues that, though the objects grasped by the *intellectus* may be on a higher level than those perceived by the senses, the *intellectus* cannot possibly be superior to the *sensus*, as it is dependent on the latter for the exercising of its functions: a thing is never superior to what it needs (§§ 11/2); it is even inferior to it, as Tert. remarks at the end of the chapter (§ 13: *per quod enim quid constat, inferius ipso est*).

That this argument is of Tert.'s own making, is shown already by the circumstances that it is based on his former discussion of the *animus* (ch. 12), and that it takes the doctrines of both Valentinus and Marcion into account. However, the most important proof for this supposition is furnished by the highly sophistical passage, in which the identity of *sensus* and *intellectus* is demonstrated (for a more detailed analysis, see the comm. *ad loc.*): arguments such as are used there can only have been invented by Tert. The idea to regard Valentinus as a Platonist, which is found already in *de praescr. haer.*, harks back to Irenaeus. The conception of the *sensus* as the fundament of the *intellectus* belongs to the Stoics; however, the proofs for it are found in Rom. 1, 20 and in a passage commonly ascribed to Anaxagoras; here again a strong influence of the Stoa on Tert. is out of the question. The two lengthy quotations from the *Phaedo* are supposed by Karpp (37₉) to have been borrowed from Soranus; I regard this supposition as improbable, firstly because it was Irenaeus who induced Tert. to regard Valentinus as a Platonist, secondly because in a chapter in which Soranus has certainly not been drawn on (28, 1) another passage from the *Phaedo* is translated as faithfully as here; for more details, see the Introduction, p. 44*.

1. **Convertor ad:** the same words occur at the beginning of *c. Chr.* 10. — **Plato . . . commendaverit:** cf. the note on 3, 1; *praescr.* 7, 7/8: *Inde aeones et formae nescio quae infinitae et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum: Platonicus fuerat* and *ib.* 30, 2: *Valentinus, Platonicae sectator.* — **agnitionem . . . consecutus:** a malicious remark referring

to 17, 12: *et in Phaedro . . . philosophabatur*. — in **Phaedone**: 65 A/B (the passage is also quoted by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 10, 67, 2). The translation is a very faithful one, as is mostly the case in Tert.'s works (cf. the note on 28, 1); the only divergences to be noted are *in quaestionem* ∼ ἐν τῇ ζητήσῃ and *neque audiamus certum, neque videamus* ∼ ὅτι οὐτ' ἀκούομεν ἀκριβὲς οὐδ' ἐν, etc. A difficulty, however, is raised by the translation of . . . τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἣ τὰ γε τοιαῦτα, where A reads *an non? an etiam* and B *an non? an non etiam*. Probably the best solution is to read: *An non etiam*, as *an non* is frequently found at the beginning of sentences (Thes. l. L. II: 5, 65/76; from Tert. cf. e. g. *fuga* 3, 2 and *adv. Marc.* 3, 22 (414, 24), where Kroymann's punctuation is to be rejected). *Obmussant* (φρουλοῦσιν) is a ἁ. λ., just as *obmussitare* in *pall.* 4, 5 (for Tert.'s use of *mussitare*, see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 28); this fact supports the supposition that the translation should be ascribed to Tert. himself. — **Epicharmi**: B 12 Diels (Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 2, 3 = 336 B): νοῦς ὀρῇ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει · τᾶλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά (for other quotations, see Staehlin's note on Clem. Alex. *strom.* 2, 5, 24, 4; from Christian literature Theodore. *Graec. affect. curat.* 1, 88 and Gregor. Nyss. *de resurr.* 190 B may be added; see also Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 166₂, and for quotations in Latin literature, Sonny, A. L. L. 8, 484/5). According to Aem. Baehrens and O. Crusius, *Philol.* 57 (1898), 645/6, Tert. borrowed the Latin translation of this verse from the *Epicharmus* of Ennius. Vahlen (*prae fat.*, CCXX₂) rejects this supposition without further comment, probably because the contents of this verse do not correspond to the fragments; we should, however, consider that our knowledge of this poem only extends to a very small part of it. At all events, the fact that the *s* at the end of the first *animus* should not be pronounced supports the attribution to Ennius (the same is found in two fragments of the *Epicharmus*, *Var.* 48 and 56 Vahlen). Besides, Vahlen himself admits that Tert. may have read Ennius (*prae fat.*, LXXXVI: "Tertullianus . . . habuit ut videtur aliquam notitiam Ennii"), as he is the only author who has preserved the words *caenacula maxima caeli* (*Ann.* 60 V.; Tert. *adv. Val.* 7), and fairly frequently alludes to the preface of the *Annales* (see the note on 33, 8; for other quotations from archaic Latin poetry in Tert., cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 24/5 and Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 99 and 112). A Christian inscription which contains a verse from Ennius (cf. Löfst., *Rh. Mus.* 67 (1912), 210₁) is an interesting example of the lasting influence of this poet. So we arrive at the conclusion that Tert. indeed may have quoted Ennius here.

2. The translation of the second passage (65 E/66 A) is not so faithful: ἀν τοῦτο ποιήσῃ καθαρώτατα ∼ *supersapere* (Tp.; Tert. has a special liking for compound verbs beginning with *super-*, see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 83/4); ὅστις ὁ τι μάλιστα αὐτῇ τῇ διανοίᾳ τοι ἐφ' ἑκαστον ∼ *qui mente maxime sapiat*; παρ᾽ αὐτὸν προτιθέμενος ∼ *proponens*; the translation of the words ἐν τῷ διανοεῖσθαι (*in recogitando*) has been put elsewhere; ἐφέλκων . . . μετὰ τοῦ λογισμοῦ ∼ *attrahens animo*; the predicate of the

subordinate clause (ἐπιχειροῖ θηρεύειν) is only rendered by *ad capiendum*, so that the construction of the sentence is altered; the words αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτό have been left untranslated; ὅ τι μάλιστα ∞ *potissimum*; οὐκ ἔωντος τὴν ψυχὴν ∞ *non permittente animae* (though after *permittere* the *accus. cum infin.* is frequently found in Latin from Tacit. downwards; Tert. has either an accusative with an infin., e. g. *ad nat.* 2, 15, 2 and *paen.* 7, 10, or a dative and an infin., e. g. *paen.* 4, 4; *bapt.* 17, 5; *ad nat.* 1, 4, 12 and 1, 10, 31). — *si egressus* (ἀπαλλαγείς): Rigaltius' conjecture *segressus*, which has been generally accepted, introduces a ᾤ. λ. into the text (it is, however, true that Tert. has a predilection for verbs beginning with *se-*; from *de anima* cf. *secedo* 58, 4; *segrego* 12, 2 and 16, 3; *sepono* 22, 1 and 52, 1; *separo* frequently). It is quite possible to retain the reading of A B and to assume an ellipsis of *est* after *egressus* (cf. the curious use of the present participle after *si* in 1, 3; it is also to be remembered that very frequently in Tert.'s works no finite verb is found after *si*: see the index on *de anima*, p. 209). This reading also departs from the Greek original, but firstly Tert. has altered the construction of the sentence in other places as well, and secondly the guiding principle, viz. the necessity to free oneself from the senses, is more clearly expressed by *si egressus* than by *segressus*, which should be put on a level with the part. *proponens*, *attrahens*, and *utens*, as Tert. has omitted to translate the words ἐπιχειροῖ θηρεύειν. A similar case is found in *res.* 44 (90, 11/2): *plane, si periturus et ipse thesaurus* (cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 48). — *quod dicendum sit* (ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν): a conversational phrase (already Ter. *Andria* 454: *quod dicendum hic siet*), like *quod sciam*, which is fairly frequent in Tert., see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 41; Médan, 91; Blase, 140. The subjunctive has not yet been explained in a satisfactory way, cf. Kroll, *Glotta* 7 (1915), 127, and 140. Cf. also *quod faciat ad = quod pertinet ad, quantum ad*, in 38, 1 and *quod sit amplius* in *c. Chr.* 11, 9. — We arrive at the conclusion that this translation was almost certainly made by Tert. himself, though of course it is possible that he has known the translation of the *Phaedo* by Apuleius, which is mentioned by Sidon. Apollin. *ep.* 2, 9, 5 (according to Bömer, *Der lat. Neuplatonismus*, 1/30, the translation of *Phaedo* 66 *seqq.* occurring in Claud. Mamert. *de stat. anim.* 2, 7 (125, 14 *seqq.* Engelbrecht) dates from the time between Cic. and Quint.; however, more is to be said for the view of Engelbrecht (*Sitz. Ber. Akad. Wien* 110 (1885), 428 *seqq.*) and E. Harleman (*De Claud. Mamert. . . quaestiones*, Uppsala 1938), who argue, that it was made by Claud. Mamert. himself).

3. *portendi*: in Tert.'s work this verb frequently means *significare* or *interpretari*, e. g. *fuga* 4, 1; *adv. Marc.* 3, 5 (382, 14); 4, 8 (440, 6); 4, 15 (464, 20); 4, 29 (522, 1); 4, 30 (525, 11); 4, 35 (543, 5), etc.; afterwards this meaning is often found in [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* and in the commentaries of Pelagius (e. g. *ad 2 Cor.* 3, 3). — *idoniorem*: a form particularly frequent in juridical literature (*Thes. l. L.* VII, 1: 229, 47 *seqq.*; Rönsch, *It.*², 278), from which it was borrowed by

Tert. (also *adv. Herm.* 18 (145, 1); the adverb, *pall.* 3, 6). — **operantes**: Tert. seems to be the first author to use *operari* as a transitive verb (also 21, 3; 44, 3; 45, 6; *bapt.* 5, 6; *paen.* 3, 12 and 12, 7; *idol.* 5 (34, 28); with a dat. § 8 (see the note), and *ad nat.* 2, 17, 8). — **subiaceant**: as far as I know, the only other instance of the use of *subiacere* in this context is found in Hier. *c. Ioann.* Hier. 26: *quod nec tactui subiacet*. — **communi conscientia**: see the note on 2, 1. — **arcano**: for the use of *arcanum* = μυστήριον by Tert., see von Soden, Z N T W 12 (1911), 218. It should be observed that Tert. always uses the subst. (and nearly always the adj.) to denote the μυστήρια of pagans and heretics, e. g. *bapt.* 2, 2: *idolorum sollemnia vel arcana*; *scorp.* 10 (166, 6): *arcana illa haeticorum sacramenta*; *res.* 19 (52, 2): *arcana haeretica*; *adv. Val.* 8 (186, 12/3); *res.* 63 (124, 26). The only exception is found in *idol.* 5 (35, 4/5): *figurae quae dispositioni alicui arcanae praestruerantur*. So this word fits perfectly into a passage referring to the *condimentarius haeticorum* (23, 5). — **supermundiales**, ὑπερκοσμίους, a. ḡ. λ., like *superterrenus res.* 49 (101, 24); for *mundialis*, see the note on 54, 4. — **ideas**: with this definition of the ἰδέαι as *formas, exempla et causas* we may compare Aët. 1, 10, 1: Ἰδέα ἐστὶν οὐσία ἀσώματος, αὐτὴ μὲν ὄφρεστώσα κατ' αὐτὴν, εἰκονίζουσα δὲ τὰς ἀμόρφους ὕλας καὶ αἰτία γινομένη τῆς τούτων δείξεως, and Apul. *de Plat.* 1, 6 (87, 20/3 Thom.): ἰδέας vero, idest formas omnium, simplices et aeternas esse nec corporales tamen; esse autem ex his, quae deus sumpserit, exempla rerum, quae sunt eruntve; cf. *ib.* 1, 5 (86, 10/2); *Asclep.* 17 (52, 12/3); Albinus *Isag.* 9 (163, 10 *seqq.* Herm.). Cicero still writes ἰδέα (*orat.* 10; *Acad.* 1, 30; *Tusc.* 1, 58); Seneca seems to be the first author to treat it as a Latin word (*ep.* 58, 26; *Thes.* 1. L. VII, 1: 178, 67 *seqq.* and 179, 25 *seqq.*). — **veritates . . . imagines**: see the note on 7, 2. Tert. has certainly been influenced here by Iren. 2, 18, 3: *quod autem dicunt (sc. Valentiniani) imagines esse haec eorum quae sunt, rursus manifestissime Democriti et Platonis sententiam edisserunt. Democritus enim primus ait, multas et varias ab universitate figuras expressas descendisse in hunc mundum. Plato vero rursus materiam dixit, et e x e m p l u m (παράδειγμα), et Deum. Quos isti sequentes figuras illius et exemplum imagines eorum quae sunt sursum, vocaverunt, per demutationem nominis semetipsos inventores et factores huiusmodi imaginariae fictionis gloriantes*; cf. also ch. 2, 5 which bears the title *ostensio non esse eam quae est secundum nos creaturam imaginem Pleromatis eorum, neque Demiurgum Unigeniti*.

4. **Relucetne**: this verb is frequently used by Tert., e. g. 35, 2; *mon.* 11: *quo autem sensu apostolus scripserit, ita relucebit si . . .*; *res.* 52 (107, 8); *adv. Marc.* 2, 20 (362, 16); 2, 24 (369, 16); 4, 33 (530, 26). *Ib.* 3, 3 (380, 6/7) it almost has the function of a copula: *ut aemulus Christi per omnes diversitatum species reluceret* (sc. Christus Marcionis); perhaps the same holds good of 5, 10 (607, 17): *sed falsum relucet* (sc. hoc). — **Gnosticorum et Valentinianorum**: for Tert., as for Irenaeus, the Valentinians are the Gnostics κατ' ἐξοχήν; cf. *scorp.* 1 (145, 8/9): *tunc Gnostici erumpunt, tunc Valentiniani proserpunt*. — **differentiam . . .**

virium: Tert. omits to point out a highly important difference between the views of Plato and Valentinus: according to the former, both forces described here are present in one and the same man, whereas the latter regards the *spiritalis* (πνευματικοί) and *animales* (ψυχικοί), who are identified here by Tert. with the *intellectuales* and the *sensuales* (for this curious identification, see the comm. on § 5), as two different classes. — **ut quinque stultae**, etc.: an allegorical interpretation of this parable by the Valentinians referring to the five senses is mentioned nowhere else; since, however, in *Exc. ex Theodoto* 86 the five wise virgins are regarded as representing the πνευματικοί, and Heracleon compared the disciples of Jesus, because they were ψυχικοί or χοϊκοί, to the foolish ones (Orig. comm. in Joh. 13, 34; cf. Förster, *Von Val. zu Herakl.*, 24/5), it seems probable that once more Tert. on his own account has identified the antithesis *sensus . . . intellectus* (*sensuales . . . intellectuales*) with the distinction between πνευματικοί and ψυχικοί made by the Valentinians. For the rest, a reference to the five senses in this connection is fairly frequently found in the first centuries of the Church, e. g. Method. *sympos.* 6, 3: διὸ δὴ καὶ ἰσάριθμοι πρὸς πέντε διαιροῦνται, ἐπειδὴ περ τὰς πέντε αἰσθήσεις αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἐφυλάξαντο καθαράς καὶ παρθένους ἀμαρτημάτων, ἃς οἱ πλεῖστοι σοφίας προσηγόρευσαν πύλας, αἱ δὲ τοῦναντίον πλήθουσιν ἀδικημάτων ἐλωβήσαντο φυράσασαι κακίᾳ; Macar. Aeg. *homil.* 4, 7 (P. G. 34, 477); Hier. *ad Matth.* 25, 1, 7; Caesar. Arelat. *serm.* 155, 1 Morin; [Theophil.] *comm. in evang.* 1, p. 299 Otto. On the other hand, Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 3, 17, 3 connects this parable with the φρόνιμοι ψυχαί, *ib.* 7, 12, 72, 5 with the γνωστικαί; cf. also Ambros. *de paradiso* 2, 11 (271, 16 *seqq.* Schenkl). — **figuraverint**: ‘symbolized’, ‘represented allegorically’; this meaning, which is found for the first time in Tert., only occurs in Christian literature (Thes. l. L. VI: 743, 48 *seqq.*). — **deceptui**: a Tp, which is also found in *adv. Marc.* 3, 6 (383, 20). Tert. has a special liking for verbal substantives ending in -us, for which cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 1; for the varying of substant. ending in -us and -io, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 72₂. — **notam expresserint**: cf. *adv. Val.* 19 (198, 6): *Archangeli . . . reliquos Aeonas exprimerent*. — **arcanam**: see the note on § 3. — **constitutam**: καθεστῶσαν = οὔσαν; the part. often has this meaning in Tert., though not as frequently as in Cypr. Wölfflin’s view (A. L. L. 7, 481) that it is to be regarded as an ‘Africanism’ has of course got out of date. According to Schrijn.-Mohrm. (*Cypr.*, 1, 10), *constitutus* is a law-term borrowed from the official style of the Church (“Aus unserem Material dürfte nach Vergleichung der Juristenteksten hervorgehen, dass dieser Sprachgebrauch sich aus der Juristensprache heraus im altchristlichen Kurialstil festgesetzt hatte”). This is quite possible, though it is rather surprising that this term is much more used by Cypr. than by Tert.: the latter is much more familiar with juridical language; at all events, we should also reckon here with the influence of the Greek. For more details, see Thes. l. L. IV: 523, 45 *seqq.*; Svonn., *Oros.*, 141 and *Pallad.*, 647; Mossberg, 69; Stangl, *Pseudoascon.*, 85; Kalb, *Roms Jur.*, 98 and *Juristenlat.*, 97; Souter, *Stud.*, 125 and *Comm.*, 32; Tidn., *Did.*, 23; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *op. cit.*, 6/10. — For

the use of *sacramentum* referring to the Gnostics, see von Soden, *op. cit.*, 209. — *hoc enim sunt*: these words are often put by Tert. at the beginning of a sentence (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 42/3). According to Tert., the *aeones et genealogiae* (almost a ἐνδιαδία, cf. c. Chr. 24, 9/10: *nescio quas illas Valentinianorum Aeonum genealogias*; however, we may also think of Coloss. 1, 26: ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν) correspond to the ἰδέαι of Plato.

5. The first sentence raises considerable difficulties, which have given rise to various conjectures. Reifferscheid writes *ex* (instead of *et*) *intellectualibus*; in confutation of this suggestion Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 59/60) rightly points out that after *dividere ex* it is usual to mention that which is divided (e. g. 16, 3), and that in this case the contrast *intellectualibus quidem . . . sensualibus vero* is annihilated. He proposes either to leave the text unaltered or to insert *in: sensum dividunt et <in> intellectualibus*, for which he gives the following explanation: "sie theilen den *sensus* ein oder richtiger sie halten ihn für etwas wesentlich Verschiedenes, je nachdem es sich um Objecte der Erkenntnis, d. i. um *invisibilia* handelt, welche nur von ihrem geistigen Samen aus erkannt werden können, oder um Objecte der Sinneswahrnehmung, welche von den körperlichen Sinnen aufgefasst werden". However, this interpretation is also impossible, for the *spiritalis semen* has nothing whatever to do with the objects of intellectual cognition; according to the doctrine of Valentinus (at least in the form known to Tert.; for further particulars, see Förster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, 74/5), it is found in a definite class of men, viz. the πνευματικοί (*adv. Val.* 29; see the note on 21, 1). Consequently, *intellectualibus*, which denotes the possessors (cf. *suo*) of this 'spiritual seed', must refer to a definite group of men, who can be no other than the πνευματικοί; similarly, *sensualibus* refers to the ψυχικοί (for this curious identification, see the next note). Linguistically Hartel's interpretation is not satisfactory either; firstly, *et* before *intellectualibus* does not receive its full due, secondly, the words *a spiritali suo semine* are not rendered rightly by the paraphrase: "which can only be known by means of their spiritual seed". It seems necessary to assume a pregnant sense of *dividunt*: "they divide the *sensus* (i. e. they distinguish between two kinds of *sensus*); in doing so (*et* = *et quidem*, cf. e. g. Seyffert-Müller, *Cic. Laelius*, 14; moreover, Tert. probably wishes to avoid a repetition of *quidem*) they assign to the *intellectuales* <a *sensus*> from (= corresponding to) their spiritual seed, but to the *sensuales* <another *sensus*> in accordance with their psychical seed, as this (i. e. the latter seed) is completely incapable of knowing spiritual substances". A similar use of *dividere* is found in *adv. Val.* 28 (204, 9/10): *dividunt enim et prophetale patrociniū in Achamoth, in semen, in Demiurgum*: "they distinguish between various kinds of the *prophetale patrociniū* and assign these to Achamoth, etc."; *ib.* 26 (202, 9 seqq.): *sic et exitum singulis dividunt: materiali quidem* (cf. *et* in the present passage) . . . *indubitatum interitum*. It is very curious that at the beginning of the sentence *sensus* means both the *vires intellectuales*

of the πνευματικοί and the *sensus corporales* of the ψυχικοί, whereas at the end (*quae sensu conveniantur*) it has its usual sense. Valentinus really seems to have assumed a higher kind of *sensus*, as is shown by *praescr.* 33, 16/8: *Aeon ille . . . generat ex sua Charite Sensum et Veritatem*. — As was already observed in the note on § 4 (*ut quinque stultae*, etc.), it is highly probable that the denomination of the *spiritalis* as *intellectuales* and of the *animales* as *sensuales* should not be ascribed to Valentinus, but to Tert., who wishes to adapt the classification made by the heretic to the contrast *intellectus-sensus* discussed in this chapter. Not only do our sources never mention a distinction of 'intellectuals' and 'sensuals' in the system of Valentinus, but we even know that this Gnostic considered the πνευματικὸν σπέρμα to be superior to the λόγος; cf. *exc. ex Theodoto* 54, 1: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀδάμ τρεῖς φύσεις γεννῶνται, πρώτη μὲν ἡ ἄλογος, ἥς ἦν Κάιν, δευτέρα δὲ ἡ λογικὴ καὶ ἡ δικαία, ἥς ἦν Ἀβελ· τρίτη δὲ ἡ πνευματικὴ, ἥς ἦν Σήθ (Iren. 1, 1, 14 only says: Ἀνθρώπων δὲ τρία γένη ὑφίστανται, πνευματικὸν, χοϊκὸν, ψυχικὸν, καθὼς ἐγένοντο Κάιν, Ἀβελ, Σήθ). Moreover, Heracleon says (cf. *Orig. comm. in Joh.* 2, 21 = 77, 22/30 Preuschen) that the λόγος, though superior to the δημιουργός, is inferior to the power which 'sows' the πνευματικοί (in *exc. ex Theodoto* 53, 5 the words λογικὴ καὶ οὐρανία ψυχὴ, μὴ κενή, ἀλλὰ μυελοῦ γέμουσα πνευματικοῦ, which at first sight might seem to contradict this interpretation, refer to the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος (*ib.* 51, 1) in Adam). It is also to be noted that the Gnostics generally avoid to denote the superior element of the soul by the word νοῦς (see e. g. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*³, 197). — *conveniantur* = *comprehendantur*: see the note on 6, 4. — *praestruximus*: Tert.'s extensive use of this verb (e. g. 25, 8; 38, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 19, 2; 2, 3, 3; *cor.* 11, 54; *bapt.* 20, 1; see also the note on 10, 3) is typical of his anxiety to guard against dangerous consequences; the conception *praescriptio*, which plays so prominent a part in his polemics against the heretics, belongs to the same sphere of thought. — *suggestum*: taken from 12, 1. — *structum*: according to Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 140), this word occurs here for the first time; however, it is almost certainly the correct reading in *Apul. met.* 11, 16 (279, 12 Helm): *structu pompae* (different readings are *strictu* and *ritu*). The only other existing instance occurs in *Arnob.* 7, 15. — *spiritum*: from ch. 11. — *extraneum quid, quam*: obviously this singular expression is due to parallelism (≈ *neque . . . aliud quid quam*).

6. *differentiam* refers to § 4 (not to § 5!). — *obsequio*: this word is omitted in A and bracketed in B; yet we are not justified in excising it, as it certainly is the *lectio difficilior*. The argument may be paraphrased by the following syllogism: "A. The difference between the two forms of cognition (*sensus* and *intellectus*) is due to the objects (*Et nunc . . . attribuantur*). B. The soul gets acquainted with the objects by means of its own components, viz. *corpus* (= *sensus*) and *animus* (*quae perinde . . . incorporalia intellegat*). C. So the different forms of knowledge are inherent in the soul (*apud animam . . . deputatis*).

obsequio must be interpreted as a final dative "both classes of objects (*et istis et illis*) being ascribed to the soul for the purpose of being at its service"; the soul is *dominatrix, regina rerum* (see the comm. on 22, 1: *dominationem rerum*). In saying that the objects, not the knowledge of the objects, must be ascribed to the soul, Tert. commits an error frequently found in philosophical treatises of all periods. For *obsequium*, cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (323, 29 seqq.): *sed et si carni delicta reputantur, praecedat animae reatus . . . cui caro ministri nomine occurrit. . .* (*carnem*) *obsequio, non arbitrio delinquentem*. We may also think of ascribing to *obsequio* the concrete meaning 'servants', viz. *corpus* (= *sensus*) and *animus* (= *intellectus*) (see for this meaning, Georges s. v.; Chruzander, 42/3; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 82 and 417; Coripp. *Justin.* 1, 188; Hegesipp. 3, 26, 4): "both classes of objects being assigned to the soul through the intermediary of its servants"; however, both the place of *obsequio* in the sentence and the singular use of the ablat. to be assumed in this case are unfavourable to this interpretation. — *salvo eo, ut*: this expression, which is particularly frequent in the fragments of Ulpianus, may have been borrowed from the idiom of lawyers; usually Tert. writes *salvo eo quod*, e. g. *res.* 20 (53, 14) and 32 (71, 7); *adv. Marc.* 2, 6 (343, 2) and 15 (355, 17); *ib.* 4, 29 (522, 3): *salvo et illo quod*.

7. *tormenta . . . veritatis*: the genitives have explicative force as in *Cypr. ep.* 73, 4: *venena subvertendae veritatis. Suspendendae* is equivalent to *torquendae*; cf. the use of this verb in the *Acta martyrum*, e. g. *Acta Prisca* 3, 14: *tunc imperator praecepit eam suspendi et unguis radi*; *Acta Carpi* 2 (23); *Acta Claudii* 1, 7 and 2, 3; from Tert.: *apol.* 30, 7. For *simplicitas*, see the note on 35, 2. — *alterum sine altero posse*: instead of *sine A B* have *ex*; Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 60) remarks: "Die alte Conjectur *sine* und die jüngste *excluso* vergreifen völlig den Sinn; denn Niemand fiel es ein, zu behaupten, dass die Erkenntnis die Wahrnehmung oder die Wahrnehmung die Erkenntnis ersetzen könne, wohl aber kommt es Tertullian darauf an, die Abhängigkeit der einen von der andern, das *alterum ex altero valere* zu verneinen, wie er denn diesen Gedanken wiederholt betont, so . . . *nunc de anima titulus et de intellectu non insidiose praeferendo locus* und . . . *videtur intellectus duce uti sensu et auctore et principali fundamento nec sine illo veritates posse contingi?*" This interpretation is entirely wrong, for the passages quoted by Hartel contain the very opposite of what he reads into them: they show that the *sensus* is not only not inferior, but even superior to the *intellectus*, as the latter is 'guided by it' and 'based on it': so the *intellectus* is certainly dependent on the *sensus*. Hartel supposes that *alterum sine altero posse* might mean the same as Reifferscheid's conjecture *alterum excluso altero posse*, viz. "that one of them might act <independently> without the other" (i. e. "might function as the substitute of the other"), whereas the meaning quite clearly is: "that one of them might exist apart from the other", which is in perfect accordance with the preceding discussion: "if the *sensus* did not have cognition, too, and the *intellectus* did not have

perception, too, we might indeed conclude that they are two separate things". Esser, 157₁, in confutation of Hartel argues that, if we read *ex altero*, this *ex* could not possibly refer to the dependence of one of these powers on the other; however, he does not say how this preposition could be interpreted in another way. It seems rather that on the contrary *ex* can only refer to such a dependence, and for this very reason cannot possibly be the correct reading; so it will be necessary to follow Bmg in writing *sine*. The error may be due to the fact that the copyist on his own account wrote down the well-known combination *alterum ex altero* (e. g. 14, 2; *alter sine altero* is found in *adv. Prax.* 22 (268, 9) and 28 = 284, 5/6). *Posse* means *esse posse*, as is often the case in Tert. (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 144 and *Beitr.*, 46; Waltz., *comm.*, 98, 224 and *Ét.*, 196; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 46₁; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 89/90); for further details, see Krumbiegel, 10; Stangl, *Woch. klass. Philol.* 1908, 919 and 1915, 210; *Pseudoascon.*, 84; Svernn., *Oros.*, 148; Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 92; Wahlén, 55₁. In *Lactant. div. instit.* 7, 3 we find both *nec alterum sine altero posse* and *alterum sine altero nihil posse*.

8. In this paragraph we have a completely unexpected antithesis of *anima* and *animus* as *domicilium sensus* and *d. intellectus*, though Tert. had just before pointed out that the latter is inherent in the former. He knows no substance corresponding to the Greek κοινὸν αἰσθητήριον; his polemical intentions leave him no time for the construction of a well-thought out system. However, the main reason for the introduction of the *anima* in this place is to be found in the succeeding argument. — **Denique a quo**: the discussion which now follows, is highly confused and hardly more than a sophistical play of thoughts. In § 6 it had been argued that in the end all possible objects are known by the soul in the following way:

invisibilia → intellectus → animus ↘	
	anima.
visibilia → sensus → corpus ↗	

In § 7 a closer connection between *sensus* and *intellectus* had been brought about by demonstrating that fundamentally *sentire* and *intellegere* are one and the same thing. Here Tert. makes a fresh start by putting the question: "*a quo sentiuntur corporalia?*" and completely overlooking his former assertion that this is done by the body. As in this 'entirely new' discussion no other powers have been mentioned than the *anima* and the *animus*, the answer can only be "*ab animo aut ab anima*". In the first case the conclusion may be drawn that the *animus* is *sensualis*, a most desirable result, but in the second the issue is that the *anima* is *sensualis*, which would leave the discussion where it was. So the conclusion arrived at in § 7 is appealed to, which declared *sentire* and *intellegere* to be identical (as if this were not plainly sufficient in itself), after which Tert. argues that the soul, when perceiving corporeal things, is *intellectualis* primarily, because to perceive is the same thing as to understand — probably the most

contorted argument ever thought out by Tert. For the sake of parallelism a similar appendix is added to the words *ergo iam et sensualis est animus* in the preceding part of the sentence; it is, of course, quite superfluous, for the *animus*, if it is capable of perceiving corporeal objects, is *sensualis* for this very reason, and not, because it is *intellectualis*, "which means that it is *sensualis* too". The answer to the second question ("*a quo intelleguntur incorporalia?*") might be expected to continue this wonderful argument (*si ab anima, ergo iam et intellectualis est anima, non tantum sensualis, nam, etc.*); however, Tert. wearies of his own reasoning and confines himself to two short questions which serve to show the inseparability of the *animus* and the *anima*, thus preparing a transition to the next part. Of the two questions only the former is to be taken seriously: "if the *animus* gets acquainted with incorporeal objects, the soul will not be absent at this cognition". In the second case the absence of the *animus* becomes, of course, quite immaterial to Tert., but he carefully avoids saying so. — *operantur*: the verb is found with a dat. since Verg. *Aen.* 3, 136; for Tert., see Waltz., *Ét.*, 136 (see also the note on § 3).

9. Here begins a new argument, which was already announced in the preceding sentences: *animus* and *anima* never leave each other, so that we are not justified in regarding the *animus* as a separate power. — *si quando*: Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 153) rightly remarks that these words should not be regarded as an introduction to the next part of the sentence, but as equivalent to *aliquando* (to the instances from Tert.'s works collected by him we may add *idol.* 14 (45, 13) and *pud.* 1 = 221, 10); still, he has to admit that this would be the only passage in which *si quando* is found at the end of a sentence. However, this difficulty may be removed, or at least diminished, by putting a comma after *quando*. Of course the words show that Tert. shrinks from even supposing that the soul might be without the *animus* (for a perfectly similar use of *si forte*, see the note on 8, 5). — *nesciamus vidisse*: for the ellipsis of the pronoun, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 52 *seqq.* — The words *nec audisse*, which in A B are found before *quia*, cannot possibly be retained; their presence here may be due to the fact that the eye of the copyist had strayed to the words *nec audisse* in the next sentence (the similarity of the two sentences has also caused the omission of the greater part of the second in A). It is only the excision of *nec audisse* which clearly brings out the parallelism of the two contrasting sentences so frequently found in polemical passages of Tert.'s works: *ut nesciamus vidisse quid vel audisse, quia alibi fuerit animus . . . ipsam animam nec vidisse nec audisse, quia alibi fuerit cum sua vi, id est animo.* — *anima dementit*: it is not necessary to follow B Gel in writing *dementit anima*, as chiasms are not at all rare in *De anima* (cf. 9, 6; 9, 8; 10, 7; 13, 1; 14, 3: *distributio animae . . . animae sectiones*); 46, 8 (*solis unguine et lavacro Iovis*); 49, 3 (*omnem terram . . . terminos orbis*); 51, 5. The present assertion is rather singular; the contrary conception is frequently found, e. g. Lactant. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 9: *primum non idem est anima et mens: . . . in furiosis mens*

extinguitur, anima manet, et ideo non exanimis, sed dementes appellantur. The most probable solution is that Tert. (who in 12, 1 explicitly identified *animus* with *mens*) wished to adduce this example, but intentionally rejected the usual explanation, as this would furnish an argument in favour of the contrary proposition; the next sentence, in which he declares that insanity wrecks the soul in the first place, supports this supposition. — *ceterum . . . casus est*: it does not seem right to translate: "this touches upon the soul in the first place" ("Das den Ausschlag Gebende ist die anima" Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 153), as in this case we should expect *res* rather than *casus* (see the note on 20, 3); to my knowledge, a similar use of *casus* is nowhere found. So La Cerda's interpretation seems to be the right one: "quod . . . pereunte anima cadente ut principaliori (*sic*), corrueat tunc etiam animus subnixus animae". The use of *ceterum* at the beginning of the sentence can only be understood by assuming a contrast with the preceding words *compatiente . . . animo*: "... the mind suffering with the soul. But <, though the mind also suffers, > it is the soul which is wrecked in the first place". — *principaliter*: the meaning 'chiefly', 'mainly' seems to occur for the first time in Tert.'s works (*pat.* 5 (6, 17/8); *pud.* 20 (266, 12); *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 (295, 4); *apol.* 6, 10; perhaps it was borrowed by him from juridical language; cf. e. g. Ulpian. *dig.* 3, 2, 4, 2). In Sen. and Plin. *ep.* the meaning is 'in a manner befitting an emperor'; cf. Löfst., *Arnob.*, 60; Friebe, 183; Goelz., *Avit.*, 494.

10. *Hoc . . . inveniat*: a similar argument is found in 17, 5: *Et unde opinio, si non a sensu? Denique nisi visus rotundam senserit turrem, nulla opinio rotunditatis*; in both cases dependence is proved by the fact that the disappearance of the fundamental factor implies the disappearance of the other. *Hoc* does not so much refer to the immediately preceding words as to the more general argument that the mind is always connected with the soul. — *subremanet*: Tp, and afterwards very rare (Rönsch, *It.*², 212; Cooper, 293). — *perinde . . . addicitur intellectus*: again the wording of the conclusion is intentionally circumstantial; cf. the note on 17, 8: *Quodsi causae . . . causas*. — *addicitur*: a law term, fairly often used in *an.* (34, 3; 40, 3; 43, 12; 52, 2). — *cognitor*: this word too has been borrowed from the idiom of lawyers (cf. Thes. l. L. III: 1487, 22 *seqq.*). The archaists are the first authors to use this word in another than the technical sense (Fronto p. 146, 4 Naber; Apul. *met.* 1, 26 and *de deo Socr.* 16). — *quod et sensus*: for *quod* = *ut*, see the note on 10, 6. — *Nihil mea interest*: here Tert. confesses no less frankly than in the first paragraph of ch. 17, in how far he takes a real interest in the whole question; again the wish to refute the heretics is at the root of the discussion: a *praelatio intellectus* may eventually lead to a *persuasio potioris dei*. — *retundenda*: see the note on 3, 3. — *perventura*: this reading is rightly defended by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 41/2), who refers to the similar personification found in *exh. cast.* 2, 13: *et ibi definitio ista in destructionem totius disciplinae*; for the use of *quoque*, see *ib.* — *potioris dei*: this refers to the *bonus deus* of Marcion; cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 6 (298, 8/10):

nam et in illo deo potiore periclitari poterit summum magnum, si depretari capit in creatore. According to Tert.'s reproduction of the system of Marcion, this God bears sway over the *invisibilia* (*ib.* 1, 16 = 310, 26/9): *non comparente igitur mundo alio sicut nec deo eius, consequens est, ut duas species rerum, visibilia et invisibilia, duobus auctoribus deis dividant et ita suo deo invisibilia defendant.* This being assumed, the next step would be to represent the realm of this 'good God' as within reach of the *intellectus* only; so a separation of the *sensus* and the *intellectus* would be a favourable condition to the conception of two realms, one of visible, and one of invisible things, and this conception might in its turn support the belief in two Gods ruling these realms. Moreover, if the *intellectus* is to be preferred to the *sensus*, the 'good God' automatically becomes a *deus potior*. The structure of the present argument is not clearly expressed: first Tert. says that he would not mind the *intellectus* being regarded as superior to the *sensus*, on the understanding that this view should not lead to regarding the *intellectus* as a separate power (*Nihil . . . retundenda est*); next a new argument is added (as is evident from the use of *quoque*): the *praelatio intellectus* might lead to the belief in a *potior deus*, i. e. a *deus intellectualium*. The structure of the thought would have been much clearer, if Tert. had written *ad persuasionem alterius et quidem de ipsa praelatione intellectus potioris dei*; but the conception of a *deus potior*, which from another context was familiar to him, has immediately come to the fore. It is not quite clear whether *potior* is here equivalent to *potentior*, a meaning frequently found in archaic Latin (for instance in the quotation from a poet in Cic. *Tusc.* 4, 32, 69: *qui plus pollet potiorque est patre*), or that the usual sense still obtains. The former meaning is by no means rare in the works of the archaists, e. g. Apul. *met.* 11, 30 (a passage containing numerous archaisms): *deus deum magnorum potior*; cf. also Chalcid. *comm.* 189: *potiora . . . numina*; Souter, *comm.*, 66; Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 87₁; Wikström, *Eran.* 40 (1942), 46; from Tert. cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 8 (345, 12): *homini . . . infirmo dominandi et non potiori angelis*. Since, however, in *apol.* 10, 6 the word is almost synonymous to *melior* (*ab illo* (sc. Saturno) *census totius vel potioris et notioris divinitatis*; Waltz, *comm.*, 84: "ce qu'il y a même de meilleur . . . parmi les dieux"; cf. *ib.* 13, 4 *deum sanctiorem*), it seems probable that both in the present passage and in *adv. Marc.* 1, 6 it is to be interpreted in the same way.

11. *de deo . . . haereticis*: viz. in *adv. Marc.* 1/2. Evidently the use of the future tense is of no importance chronologically (in 21, 6 *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 is referred to; in *res.* 17 (47, 23) the present tense is found instead of the perf. in a reference to *De anima*; see my discussion in *Mnemos.* III ser., 3 (1936), 168). — *suo* = *proprio*: Hoppe, *Synt.*, 103; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 95/6. — *campo*: 'lists', 'arena'; see Thes. I. L. III: 221, 17/84; cf. e. g. Novat. *trin.* 28: *campus . . . et quidem latus ac fusus aperietur . . . haereticum . . . si agitare voluerimus*; Lactant. *div. instit.* 3, 17, 1: *ut eos* (sc. philosophos) *. . . nostro campo insequamur*. — *experiemur*: cf. 3, 1. — *titulus* refers to the work

(*de anima* as opposed to *adv. Marc.*; for *titulus*, see the note on 3, 4), *locus* to the passage. — *Nam etsi potiora sunt*, etc.: in contrast with the discussion in § 10, the *praelatio intellectus* is definitely rejected: the 'preference' can only refer to the objects. Then the last decisive step is taken by the statement that the *intellectus* is even inferior to the senses; a transition to this statement, which is the very opposite of the view mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, was prepared in §§ 6/8b by the identification of the *sensus* with the *intellectus*: the *intellectus* is based on the *sensus*, so it is dependent upon it and cannot possibly be superior to it. It is, however, not before the last sentence that Tert. dares to state that the *intellectus* is even inferior. Of course he is familiar with the doctrine "*nihil esse in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*" from the Stoics (see the excellent discussion by Esser, p. 174), but his reasoning in § 12 is completely different.

12. *veritates . . . imagines*: see the note on 7, 2. — Rom. 1, 20 is also quoted in *adv. Hermog.* 45 (175, 19/20) and alluded to in *adv. Marc.* 4, 25 (504, 12/3; perhaps also in *apol.* 17, 2); cf. Heinze, *Apol.*, 373/4 and Lortz, 1, 231/2 (cf. also Tatian. *orat.* 4). — *factitamentis* (τοῖς ποιήμασι): *ἀ. λ.* (*It. codd. d g*, Aug. *spec.* 30 (200, 17 W.), and *Vulg.*: *per ea quae facta sunt*). — *facies . . . apparent*: this quotation is not found in Plato; it is, however, adduced by Sext. Empir. *adv. math.* 7, 374 (without the name of an author): ὁψις ἐστὶ τῶν ἀδῆλων τὰ φαινόμενα. This leads to the supposition that it was mentioned by Aenesidemus and borrowed from the *Vetusta Placita* by Soranus (cf. the Introduction, p. 30*). — *necesse . . . alterius*: *Tim.* 29 B: πᾶσα ἀνάγκη τόνδε τὸν κόσμον εἶκόνα τινὸς εἶναι (also adduced by Philo *de provid.* 1, 21); this quotation shows that Gelenius' conjecture *necesse esse* instead of *n. est* is wrong. — *ecquid tibi videtur*: Reifferscheid's conjecture *ecquid* is certainly right; as to the second word, it seems better to follow Kroymann (*tibi*; Reiff.: *ibi*), as *ecquid tibi videtur* is found in *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (301, 28; *exh. cast.* 9, 9: *ecquid videtur tibi*). In all these passages, just as in *idol.* 11 (42, 18) and *adv. Marc.* 4, 7 (433, 16), *ecquid* has the meaning 'nonne' (cf. Thes. l. l. V, 2: 55, 34 *seqq.* and Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 117₂). For *ecquis* and *et quis* in manuscripts, see Stangl, *Tull.*, 19; Birt, A. L. L. 15, 76/80; Kroll's note on Catull. 10, 8.

13. The first conclusion is taken from § 12, the second from §§ 9/10. The parentheses contain theses invented for the occasion, such as are frequently found in Tert.'s works, e. g. *c. Chr.* 11, 20/2: *Sed nec esse quidem potest, nihil habens per quod sit. Cum autem sit, habeat necesse est aliquid, per quod est*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 3 (294, 10): *ergo non aliter erit quam per quod habet esse*; *adv. Prax.* 26 (278, 10/1). In the first parenthesis we must of course read *per quod* (Kroymann); the reading *per quem* given by A is certainly due to the fact that the same words are found at the end of § 12.

19. *Children already possess the intellect.*

"We must also discuss a view upheld by some people, viz. that neither the *intellectus* nor the mind are inherent in the soul from the moment of birth, and so must have been introduced into it afterwards (§ 1). They assert that children possess souls only, and so are not able to think, but only to live, not everything that lives being capable of thinking; in support of this view they refer to Aristotle's statements on trees (this philosopher attributed the *substantia animalis* to all living beings, whereas we Christians regard the human soul, which sprang from the breath of God, as a special substance) (§ 2). However, if for the purpose of refuting us the case of the trees is brought forward, I will gladly discuss this subject. For trees, as soon as they have come into existence, have souls of their own; when they are still young, they already possess all faculties belonging to their kind (§ 3). They even have intellect, as may be recognized by observing the growth of the vine (§ 4) and the ivy (§ 5). Now, if young trees have their own kind of intellect, how much more this will be the case with young human beings! (§ 6). — By greeting life with tears at the moment of birth the child shows that it possesses both *sensus* and *intellectus* (§ 7). These tears are often regarded as an announcement of the misery of life; if so, the new-born child can even prophesy, to say nothing of its ability to think! (§ 8). This ability is also proved by the fact that it recognizes its mother and its nurse by their breath. <Holy Scripture, too, furnishes an argument:> for the children killed at Bethlehem and those who ran to meet Jesus must certainly have possessed *sensus* and *intellectus* (§ 9)".

The view combated here by Tert. can be no other than that of the Stoics, who did not credit man with all faculties at the moment of birth. Probably he found a short description in Soranus, similar to the account given by Aët. 5, 23 (*DDG* 434/5 = *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 764; copied by [Galen] *hist. philos.* 127 = *DDG* 646, 5/7): (Πότε ἄρχεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς τελειότητος) Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ ἄρχεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς τελειότητος περὶ τὴν δευτέραν ἐβδομάδα, περὶ ἣν ὁ σπερματικὸς κινεῖται ὁρρός. καὶ γὰρ τὰ δένδρα ἄρχεται τότε τελειότητος, ὅταν ἄρχηται γεννᾶν τὰ σπέρματα... περὶ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἐβδομάδα ἔννοια γίνεται καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτῶν (in *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 757 embryos are put on a level with trees). According to the Stoics, the *sapientia* begins at the moment that the τελειότης is reached; cf. e. g. Sen. *ep.* 124, 8: *et non magis infans ad hoc boni capax est quam arbor aut mutum aliquod animal. quare autem bonum in arbore animalique mutum non est? quia nec ratio.* Cf. also 38, 2: *non quia Asclepiades* (Tert. borrowed the name from the *Vetusta Placita* through the intermediary of Soranus; see the Introduction, p. 26*) *inde* (sc. a quarto decimo anno) *sapientiam supputat.* However, Tert. does not stick to the contents of this account; if so, he would have written: "They say that children do not yet possess all psychic faculties, for instance the faculty of thinking, and in support of this assertion they refer to the trees, which they

declare to be not immediately full-grown either". Instead of this he writes that, according to his opponents, trees are totally devoid of the faculty of thinking ("they say that children do not yet possess the faculty of thinking, and in order to prove this they point out that not every living being can think, for instance trees"). This was the view of both Aristotle (as is clearly stated in the text) and the Stoics (see the note on § 4); Tert. must have borrowed his account of Aristotle's view from the same source as the first-mentioned opinion of the Stoics, because it is also mentioned by Aëtius (5, 26, 2): 'Α. ἐμψυχα μὲν (sc. τὰ φυτὰ λέγει), οὐ μὴν ζῶα· τὰ γὰρ ζῶα ὁρμητικὰ εἶναι καὶ αἰσθητικὰ, ἐνία δὲ καὶ λογικά (for further particulars, see the comm. on § 2). Tert.'s refutation (§§ 3/6) of the opposite view reproduced in this form is constructed in the following way: he begins by arguing that from the very beginning of their existence trees possess a *propria vis animae*, which, though not immediately perceptible, is nevertheless present; in other words, he contends that they attain their τελειότης at once. Thus he combats the motivation given by the Stoics (which he had omitted to mention) for their assertion that human beings are not adult at once; he might have added that this refutation virtually disposes of the view of the Stoics with regard to children as well, and this again might have led him to the conclusion that man already in his youth is in possession of all faculties of the soul, the *intellectus* included. However, he goes further, and in §§ 4 and 5 combats both opposite views (viz. that young trees have not yet attained their τελειότης, and that trees in general lack the faculty of thinking) by the audacious assertion (which obviously was invented for the occasion) that young plants already possess the faculty of thinking; this assertion serves as an *argumentum a fortiori* for his view that children are capable of thinking, and so possess the *intellectus*.

It is obvious that the two doxographical notes referred to have come from Soranus. On the other hand, I cannot subscribe to Karpp's view (p. 45) that Tert. borrowed both the thesis upheld in this chapter and the refutation of the opposite view from the same author, this thesis being entirely due to the needs of the moment. In 38, 1 Tert. quietly adopts the contrary view held by the Stoics and Asclepiades (which hence may almost certainly be ascribed to Soranus as well; cf. the Introduction, pp. 30* and 33*/4*), who declared that man is not in possession of the *sapientia* before the age of fourteen (cf. especially the words: *quia Asclepiades inde sapientiam supputat*). Moreover, the adaptation of the material is in perfect accordance with Tert.'s usual method; this applies in a still higher degree to the structure of the refutation, in which the opponents are crushed *secundo gradu* (see the note on 24, 4) by means of a highly audacious assertion. Referring to §§ 4 and 5 Karpp (p. 38₁₁) points out that Soranus had a predilection for comparisons drawn from nature. It is, indeed, possible that such examples were mentioned by him, similar descriptions of the ivy and the vine, which undoubtedly hark back to the Stoics, being found in Philo's works (see the comm.); however, as to their interpretation Tert. holds the very opposite view. Finally,

we should not overlook the fact that Tert. *a priori* wishes to demonstrate that the soul possesses all its faculties from the very moment of birth: it is only by maintaining this view that he may hope to refute the doctrine of metempsychosis.

Esser (p. 121/2) gives this interpretation of the discussion of the *sapientiae arborum* that, according to Tert., “thoughts have been actualized in the plants”, so that this *sapientia* should mean “die innere Zweckthätigkeit der Organismen, das Planvolle im Pflanzenleben, das von den ersten Anfängen an nach einem allumfassenden Plane sich bethätigt und einem fixierten Endziele zustrebt”. This is the Stoic view, which was especially upheld by Philo, cf. *de opif. mundi* 43 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 713): ‘Ἄλλ’ οὐ μόνον ἦσαν οἱ καρποὶ τροφαὶ ζῴοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρασκευαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὁμοίων αἰεὶ γένεσιν, τὰς σπερματικὰς οὐσίας περιέχουσαι, ἐν αἷς ἀδηλοὶ καὶ ἀφανεῖς οἱ λόγοι τῶν ὅλων εἰσὶ, δῆλοι καὶ φανεροὶ γινόμενοι καιρῶν περιόδοις (for further details, see the comm. on § 4). As is often the case, Esser tries to systematize statements of Tert., which are due to the need of the moment exclusively. There can be no doubt about the fact that, according to Tert., plants must be able to have thoughts in the most active sense of the word, as the entire discussion must lead to the conclusion: *intelleg<i>t et infantia ligni, quanto magis hominis*; moreover, the words *vitem . . . intellegentem . . . iam opera sua* in § 4 are perfectly plain.

1. **viduant**: a poetical word, in use since Verg. *Aen.* 8, 571; *Georg.* 4, 518; Hor. *carm.* 2, 9, 8. — **viam sternunt**: cf. 16, 4.

2. **arbores . . . Aristotelen**: plants are ἔμψυχα, as they are living beings, but not ζῶα, *de invent. et senect.* 1 (467b 23 seqq.): ἡ δὲ ζῆ, ταύτῃ ζῶον ὑπάρχειν οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον· τὰ γὰρ φυτὰ ζῆ μὲν, οὐκ ἔχει δ’ αἰσθῆσιν, τῷ δ’ αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸ ζῶον πρὸς τὸ μὴ ζῶον διορίζομεν; *de anim.* 1, 5 (410b 22/3); 2, 2 (413a 25 seqq.); *de gener. animal.* 1, 23 (731b 4/5); 2, 1 (732a 11/3); cf. Rüschke, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 189₄ and 201₂. — **substantiam animale**m: e. g. *de anim.* 1, 5 (411b 27/9): ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐν τοῖς φυτοῖς ἀρχὴ ψυχὴ τις εἶναι· μόνῃς γὰρ ταύτῃς κοινωνεῖ καὶ ζῶα καὶ φυτὰ; 2, 12 (424a 32/4): καὶ διὰ τί ποτε τὰ φυτὰ οὐκ αἰσθάνεται, ἔχοντά τι μῶριον ψυχικόν. — **et si quis alius . . . nasci**: according to Tert., Aristotle degrades the soul by attributing it to all living things; it is only by this degradation that it becomes possible to postulate the existence of souls devoid of reason and so to contend that children, though in possession of a soul (which fact is doubted by nobody), need not for that reason be able to think. If, on the contrary, the soul is regarded as a property peculiar to human beings, which has originated from the breath of God, it becomes much more difficult to detach it from the *intellectus*. After this we should expect the conclusion that, though trees may be devoid of reason, this fact has no consequences for the human soul, as this is a *privata res* and cannot possibly be put on a level with plants; instead of this Tert. chooses the more sensational method of demon-

strating that trees are able to think. — **et si quis alius** may refer to the Stoics; see Aët. 5, 26, 3 and the comm. on § 4. — **in universa communicat**: the use of *in* with an accus. after this verb (also *adv. Prax.* 3 (231, 9); *adv. Val.* 25 (201, 21); *adv. Marc.* 3, 15 = 400,24) seems to be due to the analogy of *conferre*. — **quod et cetera, sc. sunt**, almost = *sicut et cetera* (see the note on 10, 6). — **non modo . . . sed**: “but rather”, as is the usual meaning in this combination (since Cic. Caes. Varro; especially frequent in Livy, see Weissenborn’s note on 1, 10, 1); cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 685; Hellmuth, 153/4; Freund, 67. — **instructu**: this subst., which is rarely found in the classic period (e. g. Cic. *de orat.* 3, 6, 23), also occurs in 32, 5 and *apol.* 6, 9 (both times combined with *victus*). The subordinate clause (*quam . . . nasci*) contains the conclusion of an elliptical syllogism: “<the soul having sprung from the breath of God, and no higher origin being possible than the origin from God, there is no reason to derive the *intellectus* from another source on account of its presumed superiority; so we may draw the conclusion that> the soul is born *cum omni instructu suo*”.

3. **provoeamur**: for this law term (cf. also *mon.* 10: *video iam hinc nos ad apostolum provocari*; *cor.* 6, 3; *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 = 347, 12), see Beck, 88/9. — **amplectemur**: see the note on 10, 7. — **necdum** may be equivalent here to *nondum*, as is assumed by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 107, though we may also translate ‘not even yet’ (the same meaning is found in *iei.* 8 (284, 7) and perhaps in *praescr.* 22, 38). In the two other passages quoted by Hoppe the meaning is different, 26, 3: *a praevento necdum* (= *et nondum*) *plenius edito* and *adv. Marc.* 4, 10 (448, 5/6): *Iudaei, solummodo hominem eius intuentes necdum et deum certi* (“a n d not yet convinced of the fact that he was God a s well”). The meaning ‘*nondum*’, which is found in poetry since Colum. 10, 55, in prose since Tac. *hist.* 1, 31, occurs in *adv. Iud.* 2, 84 and 6, 29. For this sense, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 641; Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 818; Kroll, Glotta 21, 102; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 34/5; Friebel, 177; Tidn., *Did.*, 95; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 404; Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 141₂; Goelz., *Avit.*, 685; *Jér.*, 434; Haussleiter, 413 and 434₃₀; Erikson, 79 (for *necdum* = *non*, which is much rarer, cf. W. A. Baehrens, B Ph W 36 (1916), 221 and *T. U.* 42, 1, p. 245; Norberg, 1, 153₀). — **arbuseulis**: here this word denotes a young tree, as in v. v. 1: *de frutice arbuscula enititur*; = *arbor* in *adv. Marc.* 4, 39 (557, 20; l. 17 *arbores*); in *adv. Val.* 20 (199, 5) the word is used contemptuously. Moreover, it often denotes the tree in paradise, *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (320, 6): *ob unius arbusculae delibationem* (here, just as in *scorp.* 5 (155, 17/8) and *iei.* 3 (277, 12), the choice of the diminutive is primarily due to *unius*; on the other hand, in *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 (642, 17): *illius arbusculae gustum*, Tert. has become used to the word and omits *unus*). — **adhuc** = *etiamtum*: this meaning is particularly frequent in poetry and in historiography; for Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 109. — **propria vis animae**: Tert. still shrinks from attributing souls to trees without any further comment, and so prefers a periphrasis by means of *vis* (cf. 25, 2 *vim animalem* = *animam*; 37, 5). Just as the soul of man, the *anima arboris* is a *privata*

res. — **Verum . . . fungatur**: if this *vis animae* is not immediately perceptible to its full extent, this is due to special causes; for the use of *fungi*, see the note on 9, 8. — **adimpleat** (B) is the correct reading, cf. v. v. 16: *adimple habitum mulieris*; *adimplere* is very frequently used by Tert. — **inornantur**: this verb only occurs in Tert.'s works (also *adv. Val.* 12 (192, 2/3): *ut autem tantum sigillarium extrinsecus quoque inornassent* and res. 16 (46, 17/8): *de coronis quoque potatoris sui inornabitur* (sc. calix) *aut aspergine florum honorabitur*). Just as in the last-mentioned passage (where Tert. wants two verbs with five syllables) the choice of the compound verb is due to parallelism (∞ *inoculantur* and *inflantur*; moreover, *condiuntur* has four syllables). For the use of *in* in compounds as a merely intensifying or almost meaningless addition, see Löfst., *Beitr.*, 116/9; Médan, 130; A. L. L. 8, 377; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 575₂ (with literature) and *Oribas.*, 75; 89; G. Wiman, *Eran.* 23 (1925), 184/5; H. Armini, *ib.* 30 (1932), 86/7; Norberg, 2, 152 and 208/9; Bendz, *Cael.*, 70. Cf. in addition *influere* = *fluere* Coripp. *Ioh.* 2, 219; 3, 94; *infirmare* = *firmare* Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 3, 4, 36. From Tert. cf. *inoperari* (Tp) *adv. Marc.* 5, 17 (634, 8); *inrufare* *iei.* 17 (296, 22) and *apol.* 22, 12 (c. *promotam . . . t. inrufatam*: 6 syll.); *inspumare* (ἀ. λ.) *apol.* 12, 6 (∞ *infrendere*). For *inunitus* = *unitus* in Apul. and Tert., see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 65, for *inesse* = *esse*, the comm. on ch. 4. — **succi condiuntur**: *condire* has pregnant sense here, = *dulces succi creantur*. As far as I know, there are no other instances of this use of *condire*. *succos condere* is found in Tibull. 1, 10, 47: *pax aluit vites et succos condidit uvae*.

4. **Inde . . . vivunt**: these words contain the transition to the subsequent discussion: plants possess all their faculties from the very beginning of their existence and, consequently, since that moment are able to think. The examples quoted in this paragraph and the next seem to have played an important part in discussions of the question whether plants have souls or not; we may especially refer to a passage from Philo (*de animal. adv. Alex.*, p. 169 Aucher = *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 730), who upholds the Stoic view (which was probably shared by Soranus and is the very opposite of Tert.'s opinion): *Quisquis autem haesitat* (sc. de communi societate), *discat ex arboribus plantisque . . . Hae enim etsi nullam habeant animae partem, tamen familiaritatis abalienationisque non minorem praeferunt manifestationem. Moventur et crescunt atque tamquam osculo dilectionis salutando amplectuntur se invicem, ut olivam hedera et ulmum vitis; aliquas tamen non solum averatur* (sc. vitis), *verum etiam evitat . . . Sed neminem arbitror adeo insanire, ut audeat dicere, haec ex fidelis amicitiae aut hostilitatis animo oriri, sed supremae naturae ratione quaedam in unum adducuntur, alia disiunguntur, haud sibi invicem convenientia*; *ib.* p. 163 (*St. V. F.* 2, frag. 732): *Si quis autem aliter putat* (i. e. does not subscribe to the view that animals do everything *sine doctrina*), *adeat arbores, et perspicies videbit cuiusque dotes clarissimas, quia et in istis multa sunt sine arte artificiosa. Vitem non vides, dum in diebus vernalibus*

germen producit? Primum enim foliis illud operit, deinde more matris paulatim nutrit, et id augmentum ducit; postmodum remutans ex acido uvam efficit, donec omnino maturet fructum. At instructane his fuit cura adhibita? Perhaps the present description was also influenced by Cic. Cato 15, 52: *vitis quidem, quae natura caduca est et, nisi fulta sit, fertur ad terram, eadem ut se erigat, claviculis suis quasi manibus, quidquid est nacta, complectitur*; cf. also *nat. deor.* 2, 47, 120 (quoted in the comm. on § 5). — *arundine*: cf. e. g. Colum. 5, 5, 8: *itaque posito semini arundo adnectitur, quae velut infantiam eius tueatur atque educet*. — *cervo*: see Varro *l. l.* 5, 117; Serv. *ad Verg. ecl.* 2, 29. For similar terms (e. g. *asellus* ('fulcri genus'), Pallad. 1, 18, 2, *capreolus* ('rafter'), *onager*), see Svénn., *Eran.* 32 (1934), 38, and Pallad., 552. — *amabit*: Latinus' conjecture *ambibit* spoils the sense of the passage, as Tert. wants to represent the vine as a ζῶον λογικόν. Cf. Ovid *am.* 2, 16, 41: *ulmus amat vitem, vitis non deserit ulmum*; Kroll's note on Catull. 62, 49 *seqq.* For Cato *agr.* 32 *arbores facito ut bene maritae sunt* (quoted by Kroll), cf. Serv. *ad Verg. Georg.* 1, 2: *adiungere] hoc autem rustici maritare dicunt*; Apul. *apol.* 88: *sub ulmo marita*; Stat. *silv.* 5, 1, 49. The reading given by A B is also supported by the next verb *amplexabitur*. — *viriosius*: this very rare adjective also occurs in Adv. Val. 16 (196, 6): *exercitata vitia et usu viriosa* (for further details, see my discussion in *Mnemos.* III ser., 12 (1944), 74/5).

5. *hederas*, etc. (for the plural, see von Geisau, *Apul. Synt.*, 17): it is more usual to mention the ivy's clinging to a tree; in this case, too, a comparison to human love is often found (see Thes. I. L. VI, 3: 2588, 42/56 and Kroll's note on Catull. 61, 32). — *ad superna conari*: the verb has its original meaning 'coniti', 'eniti' (Ter. *Phorm.* 52: *at ego obviam conabar tibi*; Haut. 240; Andr. 676; with a prepos. since Liv. 42, 65, 8: *qui in tumultum conabantur*; cf. Thes. I. L. IV: 349, 58/82; Hartel, A. L. L. 3, 17; Thielmann 8, 510 (who wrongly assumes an 'Africanism' here). From Tert. cf. *res.* 52 (108, 20): (martyres) *qui ad superiora conantur* (cf. Apul. *de mundo* 8: *ad superiora minari* and *ib.* 12: *ad superna minari*); *apol.* 47, 3: *dum* (sc. philosophi) *ad nostra conantur* (in the Thes. I. L. this passage together with some others, e. g. Aug. *confess.* 4, 15, 26: *conabar ad te et repellebar abs te*, is separated from the examples just mentioned and put under the heading: "I. tempto, περιῶμαι, incipio, audeo; a) absolute"; however, it cannot be right to regard the use of *conari* in *apol.* 47, 3 as different from that in *res.* 52). To the passages adduced in the Thes. may be added: Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 119: *ad maiora conari*; Aug. *de lib. arb.* 1, 11, 22: *conantem in lucem intellegendi*; *de gen. ad litt.* 4, 21, 38; Faust. *Rei. de grat.* 1, 1 (7, 20/1 Eng.); Muscio 2, 31, 84: *in directum conantur*. With the description which follows we may compare Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 47, 120: *iam vero vites sic claviculis adminicula, tamquam manibus apprehendunt atque ita se erigunt ut animantes. quin etiam a caulibus brassicisque, si propter sati sint, ut a pestiferis et nocentibus refugere dicuntur nec eos ulla ex parte contingere*. — *suspendi* should be interpreted as a Greek medium (the choice of the passive form is due to

the preceding *conari*); with an intransitive sense *suspendere* occurs in *pall.* 3, 3 (see the note on 52, 2). — *parietibus invehi*: this verb is very rarely joined on to a dative denoting direction (*Liv.* 1, 59, 10). — *textili silva* . . . *voluntaria iniuria*: according to H. Koch, *Rh. Mus.* N. F. 78 (1929), 430, these ablatives have modal sense and are equivalent to an apposition; in his opinion, many ablatives in *Cypr.* are to be interpreted in this way. As to the words *textili silva*, he subscribes to Kellner's translation: "weil er lieber an den Wänden hängend einen verschlungenen Wald bildet"; for *voluntaria iniuria* (Kellner: "als sich auf der Erde von frevlem Mutwillen zertreten lassen will") he proposes this interpretation: "in selbstgewählter Misshandlung, was eine selbstgewollte Misshandlung wäre". However, Schrijnen-Mohrm. (*Cypr.*, 1, 123/4) have demonstrated that in the passages quoted by Koch from *Cypr.* the ablative rather denotes the result of the action expressed by the predicate. For instance, in *ep.* 70, 3 (769, 19 H.): *una ecclesia a Christo domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata*, we should not follow Koch in saying that the *origo et ratio unitatis* consists in the foundation of the Church *super Petrum*, but rather regard it as the outcome of this foundation (for further details, see my notes on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 290 and 349, and *Merkx*, 65/71). Nevertheless, though with regard to the passages from *Cypr.* adduced by Koch, Schrijnen and Mohrmann are certainly right, it cannot be denied that in many cases an ablat. (or absol. ablat.) having modal sense becomes almost equivalent to an apposition. The point at issue is whether the idea expressed by the modal ablative only denotes a special aspect of the action mentioned by the principal verb or if it also includes the immediate consequences of that action; in the former case we have to assume an 'appositive' ablative, in the latter a 'resultative' one. Sometimes it is impossible to decide which meaning should be assumed; for instance, in *Plin. n. h.* 10, 170: (*catuli serpentis*) *perrumpunt latera (sc. matris) occisa parente*, it might be doubted whether we should translate: "which means the death of the mother" or "which causes the death of the mother" (the former case is more probable, the 'appositive' ablative being rather frequent in this work, as was already pointed out by Koch; cf. also 7, 72: *risisse eodem die quo genitus esset . . . Zoroastren . . . futurae praesagio scientiae* (his laughing was the augury); 11, 197: *dracones emicuisse de extis laeto prodigio*; 2, 84, 101). Isolated instances of this idiom may be quoted from earlier authors, e. g. *Ovid met.* 7, 552: (*post animalia pestis*) *pervenit ad miseros damno graviore colonos* ("after the animals human beings were also attacked by the plague, which was a more serious calamity"); *Liv.* 43, 1: *per Illyricum ducere legiones in Macedoniam vano incepto est conatus* ("he tried to lead the legions to Macedonia — an idle enterprise"); 37, 31, 1: *Antiochus . . . praesidium ab Lysimachia . . . deduci pravo, ut res ipsa postea docuit, consilio iussit*; 38, 23, 4, etc. From *Tac. cf. ann.* 14, 14, 2: *clausumque valle Vaticana spatium, in quo equos regeret, haud promisco spectaculo*, 1, 62, 1 (cf. *Kroll's note on Catull.* 65, 19), and 3, 12, 1 (cf. *Sörbom*, 126), from *Suet. Tib.* 9 and *Tit.* 10. *Tert.* gives one certain

instance in *cult. fem.* 2, 7, 1: *aliae* (sc. crines gestiunt) *ut vagi et volucres elabantur, non bona simplicitate*. For the 'resultative' ablative too various examples (or at any rate various passages showing the gradual growth of this idiom) may be quoted from an earlier period. We may begin by referring to such sentences as *Verres Syracusas venit cum magna calamitate civium* and *hoc damno meo factum est* (cf. Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 410/1 and Helm's note on *Ciris* 58). Fully developed instances are found in Catull. 15, 18/9: *quem attractis pedibus patente porta / percurrent raphanique mugilesque* (Kroll: "scil. pedes attrahuntur, ut porta latius pateat"); Ovid *met.* 6, 260: (sanguis) *longe terebrata prosilit aura*; 15, 741: (amnis) *porrigit aequalis media tellure lacertos* (cf. perhaps Caes. *bell. Gall.* 4, 10, 4); Liv. 30, 38, 8: *in Veliterno agro terra ingentibus cavernis cōsedit* (the caverns are due to the subsiding of the earth); ib. 44, 41, 7: *si . . . circumagere hastam cogas, confusa strue implicantur*; Apul. *met.* 11, 2 (267, 9 Helm): *aeterna subole humano genere propagato* (Médan, 49: "de manière à en faire une race éternelle"). From Tert., as far as I know, no unequivocal examples can be quoted (the words *violento puerperio* found in 25, 5 I interpret with Koch (unlike Merxx, 67) as an 'appositive' ablative). Such passages as Cypr. *ep.* 37, 4 (579, 9 H.) *super petram robusta mole fundati* are very frequent afterwards, e. g. Hier. *adv. Pelag.* 1, 14: *super quem* (sc. Petrum) *ecclesia Domini stabili mole fundata est*; Boëth. *consol.* 4, 1, 7: *multaque . . . quae . . . firma te soliditate corroborent*; Cassian. *instit. lib.* 7, 31: *patientiae virtus . . . firma soliditate fundata*. For Paulin. Nol. *carm.* 27, 366: *vestibulum medio reseratur in aethera campo* (cf. Ovid *met.* 15, 741, quoted above) and 28, 10, see Goldschmidt's note, p. 166. Perhaps in *carm. de provid. div.* 401/2 (the passage through the Red Sea is described): *divisum pelagus, solidoque rigore ligatas/instar montis aquas vacuo cessisse profundo* the words *vacuo . . . profundo* also have 'resultative' sense. — *quibus de aedificio male est*: just as in 33, 10 (*o iudicia divina post mortem . . . contemptibilia de poenis, fastidibilia de gratiis*) it may be doubted whether *de* has causal or restrictive sense ('as regards'); the alternative is perhaps more probable, as an ablat. *limitationis* is connected with *bene (male) est* in *ad nat.* 2, 5, 10: *cum quis valetudine male est* and *pall.* 1, 1: *ab imperio et a caelo bene est* (for three other passages from Tert. where *ab* is joined on to this ablat., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 33; for further details, see Thes. l. L. I: 35, 3 *seqq.*; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 335/6; Linderbauer, 117/8 and 206; Hand, *Tursellin.*, 1, 28; Freund, 51; Kroll's note on Cic. *Brutus* 63; A. Erikson, 42; for the use in Greek (*Papyr. Paris.* 10, 20: *πλετὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων* instead of *τοὺς ὤμους*), see Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 139). — *refugiunt*: cf. the passage from Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 47, 120 quoted above and Varro *r. r.* 1, 16, 6: *quod* (sc. querquetum) *usque eo est contrarium natura* (sc. oleis), *ut arbores non solum minus ferant, sed etiam fugiant*. — *ramos . . . destinatos*: according to Hartel (*Patr. Stud.* 4, 61), we should supply *refugere* or *tendere* after *altiorum* and translate *destinare* by 'to fasten', which is the original meaning of the verb. This interpretation of *destinare* is supported by the fact that more agricultural terms are used in these paragraphs (§ 4 *arundo*,

cervus; § 6 *surculus*, *propago*, *fovea*), and that this meaning also occurs in other passages in Tert.'s works, viz. *mart.* 3: *fossam moliendo, testudinem destinando* and *scorp.* 1 (146, 14/5): *nos ipsi ut lepores, destinata venatio, de longinquo obsidemur* ('fere i. q. indagine sudibus facta', *Thes.* 1. L. V, 1: 755, 67/8). On the other hand, it is highly improbable that such a verb as *tendere* should indeed be added mentally, so that after all the translation "that the branches are destined (or: intend) <to grow> into another direction" is more plausible. The combination *alioisum destinari* is similar to *ad superna conari*, which occurs at the beginning of this paragraph. — **divortio parietis**: see the note on 7, 3. — **animationem**: this rare word (also in *adv. Marc.* 2, 3 (336, 26) and *adv. Val.* 9 = 188, 1) occurs only once before Tert., viz. in *Cic. Tim.* 10: *divinae animationis*. — **ex primordio . . . fruticis**: the genitive seems to have explicative force: "since its beginning, viz. its existence as a shrub". Parallels are perhaps furnished by *adv. Iud.* 5, 2/3 *a primordio maioris filii, id est Israel* (the text is altered by Kroymann) and *res.* 16 (46, 25/6): *caro . . . ab exordio uteri consata . . . animae* ("from the beginning, viz. <the being in> the womb"). For *edidicit*, see the note on 43, 12.

6. **infantia ligni**: in *Plin. n. h.* 15, 80 we find *infantiam pomi* and in *Pallad.* 10, 14, 1: *tubures seremus subole vel nucleis, cuius tenera diligenter nutriri debet infantia* (cf. *Svenn., Pallad.*, 79), so it is probable that here again Tert. follows the idiom of farmers, though it is true that this combination is at the same time required by the context. The phrase *intellegat et infantia ligni* contains a skilful combination of the two relevant views ('*infantia ligni plene animata est*' — '*lignum intellectum habet*'). — **quo magis** (also *adv. Herm.* 4 (130, 20) and *iei.* 10 = 286, 21) and **quanto magis** (cf. *Hartel, Patr. Stud.*, 1, 47) usually introduce an *argumentum a fortiori*. — The next passage together with *testim. anim.* 3 (138, 1 *seqq.*) may be called the *locus classicus* of traducianism (for the foundations of this conception, see the preface to ch. 27). The seed of the soul which is present in the sperm of the father (this seed here corresponds to the *surculus*) at the moment of conception is entrusted to the womb as its soil. The 'agrarian' terminology is due to the comparison with the *infantia ligni*. A very similar passage is found in the contemporary treatise *de pallio* (2, 6): *ut inde velut ex surculis et propaginibus populi de populis . . . pangerentur*. — **matrice**: this word here means 'stem' (as opposed to the shoots), which, together with 'mother-animal', is the original meaning. For Tert.'s use of this subst., see *Hoppe, Synt.*, 175, especially 20, 6: (*natura animae*) *quam deus in Adam contulit et matricem omnium (sc. animarum) fecit*. — **in propaginem deducta**: "derived to be a layer" (*propago* is almost equivalent to *surculus*, see the passage from *de pallio* just quoted) = "derived as a layer" (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 1, 19: *progeniem . . . Troiano a sanguine duci*). This use of *in* may be due to the influence of the language of Holy Scripture, cf. e. g. *iei.* 4 (278, 11): *vobis erit in escam* (*Gen.* 1, 29 ὑμῖν ἔσται εἰς βρώσιν); for further details, see *Hofm., Synt.*, 537/8; *Bonnet*, 620; *Süss, Stud.* z.

lat. Bibel, 1, 82/3; cf. also the comm. on 33, 3. Yet it should be noted that this 'in identitatis' is found almost exclusively after *esse*, *fieri*, *nasci*, *habere*, *ponere*, *dare*, and *adoptare* (in *Pass. Perpet.* 15, 7: *puellam, quam sibi quaedam soror in filiam educavit*, the use of *in* after *educare* is due to the analogy of *adoptare in filium*); besides, isolated instances of 'in identitatis' after other verbs may be quoted from pagan literature (e. g. *Sen. ep.* 86, 4: *turres . . . in propugnaculum villae . . . subrectas*, where there can be no doubt that the towers are the *prop. vill.*). So it does not seem necessary to assume a 'Christianism' here. Another interpretation also suggests itself, viz. to regard *propago* as equivalent to *propagatio*; however, it should be remembered that this meaning is only found in very late texts (e. g. *carm. de resurr. mort.* 19: *quae creata malo primum moriendi propago*; perhaps this meaning may be found in 2, 6: *propagine quaestionum — implicationes expeditionum*). — *foveis*: cf. the use of *sulcus* and *arvum* in 27, 8. — *commendata*: a poetical term, e. g. *Sil. Ital.* 15, 539: *Libys Ausoniis commendat semina sulcis*; see *Thes. l. L.* III; 1841, 71 *seqq.* — *tam . . . quam et*: see the note on 1, 6.

7. *Mentior, si*: this expression, which is frequent in Tert.'s works, may have been borrowed by him from *Sen.* (e. g. *nat. quaest.* 3, 30, 3; *ep.* 106, 5). — *ut . . . salutavit*: see the note on § 8. — *ibidem*: 'immediately'; this meaning is found for the first time in *Lucr.* 6, 792. 1234 and then not before *Quint.* (the interpretation of *Cic. Rosc. Amerin.* 5, 13: *ne hic ibidem ante oculos vestros trucidetur* is not quite certain); for instances from *Tert.*, see *Waltz., Ét.*, 263 (cf. also *adv. Prax.* 14 (252, 12): *statim atque ibidem*). — *dedicans = initians*. *Tert.* is probably the first author to use *dedicare* in this sense (at all events, it is not certain whether the first example quoted by the *Thes. l. L.* is prior to *Tert.*, viz. *It. Hebr.* 10, 20 (*Mutian. Chrysost. homil.* 19, 1): *quam nobis dedicavit* (ἐνέχαλινεν, *Vulg. initiavit*) *viam novam*. Many instances are mentioned by *Hoppe, Synt.*, 128 (cf. also *apol.* 12, 3; *ad nat.* 1, 18, 3; *mon.* 4, 6; *scorp.* 3 (151, 14); *iei.* 8 = 283, 31). It often is not possible to decide how far the original meaning still obtains (according to *Hoppe*, 128₁, this is the case here), e. g. 45, 3; *scorp.* 1 (145, 1/2): *donati a deo ea potestate, quam apostolus dedicavit*; *res.* 11 (40, 8/9); *adv. Herm.* 29 (156, 22); *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (320, 21). For further details, see *Thes. l. L.* V, 1: 261, 8 *seqq.*; *Rönsch, Sem.*, 3, 23; *Goelz., Jér.*, 255 (this meaning is extremely frequent in *Hier.*, who almost certainly follows *Tert.* here); other instances are found in *Petr. Chrysol. serm.* 154 (608 C); 175 (656 B); *Pont. Vit. Cypr.* 17, 3; *Priscill. p.* 95, 20 *Schepss*; *ep. de cast.* 3, 5 (p. 125 *Caspari*); *ib.* 6, 2 (p. 133); *Acta Archelai* 22, 2; *dedicator = initiator* occurs in *apol.* 5, 3 and *c. Chr.* 17, 11. — *Humore*: viz. maternal milk. — *terra tactum*: this has nothing to do with the habit of tollere infantem (the existence of which habit is highly questionable though), but refers to delivery on the ground; see *H. Wagenvoort, Imperium* (Amsterdam 1941), 20₁, who quotes passages from *Ovid* (of which *trist.* 4, 3, 46 is very similar to the present passage: *tacta . . . nascenti . . . humus*), *Suet.*, and *Plin.*

n. h. Numerous instances may be added, e. g. Hom. *Il.* 19, 110: *ὅς κεν ἐπ' ἡματι τῶδε πέσῃ μετὰ ποσσὶ γυναικός* (van Leeuwen in his note refers to Dutch "bevallen", "werpen", Germ. "niederkommen", Fr. "accoucher"); [Callisthen.] 1, 12, 9 (13, 10 Kroll): *πεσόντος ἐπὶ γῆς τοῦ βρέφους*; *Apoc. Sedrach* 11 (*Apocr. Anecd.*, James, I: 135, 4); Suet. *Nero* 6; *Mart. Petri* 13 (*Act. apost. apocr.* I: 16, 10/1): *sic enim nascimur, ut proni videamur in terram effundi*; Fulgent. *Verg. contin.* p. 92, 7/8 Helm; Muscio 1, 52 (19, 4 Rose) and 1, 76 (28, 10). This passage should almost certainly be interpreted in the same way, though Soran. (!) *Gynaec.* 2, 10 (79) suggests another possibility: *ἡ τοίνυν μαῖα τὸ βρέφος ἀποδεξαμένη πρότερον εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀποτιθέσθω*; cf. also J. Ilberg, *A R W* 13 (1910), 15. — *de primis sensuum motibus*: the reading *motibus* is due to a conjecture by Thörnell (*vocibus B, om. A*), who refers to *adv. Prax.* 5 (234, 5/6): *ad omnem cogitatus tui motum, ad omnem sensus tui pulsum*. The repetition of the words *de primis* suggests a parallelism (in which case we may best follow Thörnell); on the other hand, if we follow A, *sensuum* is also governed by *pulsibus*, as in the passage quoted from *adv. Prax.* (perhaps this interpretation is also supported by the fact that *sensisse* and *intellexisse* are closely connected). For *pulsibus*, cf. also *res.* 61 (122, 15): *ad pulsus linguae temperandos*, and for the metaphor, the notes on 6, 3: *velut sigillario motu superficiem intus agitante*, and 14, 5. — *cogitur*: this verb is used in a similar context in *ad nat.* 1, 8, 7: *obtusum et exarticulatum sonum . . . de solis faucibus cogi licet*, and Novat. *de trin.* 31: *tono coactae de visceribus vocis*.

8. *Plus est quod*: this expression is very frequent in Tert. (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 65). — *de . . . interpretantur* probably refers in the first place to Lucr. 5, 222/7, especially 226/7: *vagituque locum lugubri complet, ut accumst / cui tantum in vita restet transire malorum* (cf. also 2, 576/7). According to Borleffs, *B Ph W* 52 (1932), 350/2, this passage has been imitated by Tert. in *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (491, 5): *nec statim lucem lacrimis auspicatus* (sc. Christus; Borleffs has overlooked the present passage). The idea is more frequently found, e. g. [Plato] *Axioch.* 366 D: *οὐ κατὰ μὲν τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν τὸ νήπιον κλαίει, τοῦ ζῆν ἀπὸ λύπης ἀρχόμενον; οὐ λείπεται γοῦν οὐδεμιᾶς ἀλγηδόνης, ἀλλ' ἡ δι' ἐνδειαν ἢ περιψυγμὸν ἢ θάλπος ἢ πληγὴν ὀδυνᾶται, λαλῆσαι μὲν οὐπω δυνάμενον ἀπάσχει, κλαυθμυρίζόμενον δὲ καὶ ταύτην τῆς δυσαρεστήσεως μίαν ἔχων φωνήν*; Sen. *consol. ad Polyb.* 4, 3: *non vides, qualem nobis vitam rerum natura promiserit, quae primum nascentium hominum fletum esse voluit? hoc principio edimur, huic omnis sequentium annorum ordo consentit*; Plin. *n. h.* 7, pr. 2: *hominem tantum nudum et in nuda humo natali die abicit* (sc. natura) *ad vagitus statim et ploratum, nullumque tot animalium aliud ad lacrimas, et has protinus vitae principio* (for some parallels from modern literature, see Munro's note on Lucr. 5, 226). Robin (in his note on Lucr. 5, 221) assumes Lucretius to have been influenced here by Crantor's treatise *Περὶ πένθους* (as is well-known, Crantor in his turn followed the *Axiochus*) or at any rate by the literature of consolatory writings. In the

passages quoted the weeping of the new-born child is represented as a suitable beginning for sorrowful life, but, as far as I know, the idea of the child itself having a foreboding of the sorrow to come is not found before Tert.; according to Epicurus, and so probably according to Lucretius as well, the immediate cause of the weeping is the child's coming into contact with the cold air for the first time (Epicur. frag. 398 Us. = Sext. Empir. *adv. math.* 11, 96: φυσικῶς καὶ ἀδιδάκτως τὸ ζῶον φεύγει μὲν τὴν ἀλγυδονά, διώκει δὲ τὴν ἡδονήν· γεννηθὲν γοῦν καὶ μηδέπω τοῖς κατὰ δόξαν δουλεῖον ἅμα τῷ ῥαπισθῆναι ἀσυνῆθει ἀέρος ψύξει ἐκλαυσέ τε καὶ ἐκώκυσεν). Hence, if Tert. by *quidam* means Lucretius (Koch, *Cypr. Unters.*, 305 and 479 thinks that the word refers to Seneca, which is less probable; perhaps the plural denotes both authors), he may have added this interpretation himself (the words *ut accumsit cui* . . . in Lucr. cannot be explained in this way); this supposition is supported by the circumstance that in this context he needed an *argumentum a fortiori*. In the works of later Christian authors we usually find the older view, e. g. Aug. *civ. dei* 21, 14: *quae* (sc. infantia) *quidem quod non a risu, sed a fletu orditur hanc lucem, quid malorum ingressa sit, nesciens prophetat quod a m m o d o*; id., *serm.* 31, 4 and *enarrat. in Ps.* 125, 10; *Cypr. pat.* 12 (405, 13/6 H.; in *ep.* 64, 6 he interprets this weeping as a *deprecari*); Zeno Veron. *tract.* 2, 8, 2; Fulgent. *Vergil. contin.* p. 93, 4/5 Helm. Greek influence may be assumed in Sap. 7, 3: καὶ ἐγὼ δὲ γενόμενος ἔσπασα τὸν κοινὸν ἀέρα καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁμοιοπαθῆ κατέπεσον γῆν πρώτην φωνὴν τὴν ὁμοίαν πᾶσιν ἴσα κλαίων. Tert.'s interpretation is also found in Hier. *ep.* 22, 19, 3: *quos vagitus delectat infantum in ipso lucis exordio fletu lugentium quod nati sunt*, and perhaps in Gregor. Nazianz. *carm.* 15, 45 *seqq.*: ἐξότε κόλπων/μητρὸς ὀλισθήσας πρῶτον ἀφῆκα δάκρυ, / ὁσαταίους, οἷς τε συναντήσασθαι ἐμελλον / πῆμασι, δακρυγέων πρὶν βιώτοιο θίγω (see for this passage, Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 154.). Lactant. *de opif. dei* 3, 1 (Usen. Epic. p. 250 *seq.*) renders the Epicurean view in this way: *itaque naturam non matrem esse humani generis, sed novercam, quae cum mutis tam liberaliter gesserit, hominem vero sic effuderit, ut inops et infirmus et omni auxilio indigens nihil aliud possit quam fragilitatis suae condicionem ploratu ac fletibus ominari, scilicet 'cui tantum in vita restet transire malorum'*. Here the passages from Lucretius and Pliny have been combined; it is not clear whether by *ominari* Lactantius means a conscious prophecy or an unconscious one. Finally, a remarkable passage from Soranus must be mentioned. In *gynaec.* 2, 11 (80), 2 this author says: "Many midwives are averse from cutting off the navel-string with a knife, as they believe iron to forebode evil. However, this is ridiculous: καὶ <γὰρ> τὸ κλαίειν αὐτὸ δυσσιώνιστόν ἐστιν, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου τὸ γεννηθὲν ἀρχεται τοῦ ζῆν". It is clear that he explicitly rejects the traditional interpretation of the weeping, which he too ascribes to the influence of the cold air (2, 11 (81), 2). — *augurem*: as in 24, 10, this word has the function of an adjunct., which is very rarely found (e. g. Claudian. *carm.* 26, 18: *Iovis augure luco*; a transitional case occurs in Hor. *carm.* 3, 17, 12: *aquae . . . augur annosa cornix*, on which Porphyrio

remarks: *augurem . . . pro praesaga id est divina posuit*); from Tert. we may also quote *testim. anim.* 5 (140, 25/6): (*animam*) *in praesagiis vatem, in omnibus augurem, in eventibus prospicem*. — **quod**: Rigaltius' conjecture *quo* is not necessary, the subordinate clause containing the reason adduced by the supporters of this view. — **ab ingressu nativitatis**: cf. 39, 1: *ab ipsa etiam ianua nativitatis*. — **nutricem**: cf. *apol.* 25, 7 (*ad nat.* 2, 17, 5): *et iucundissimum illic nutricis suae odorem*; cf. also Aug. *de quantit. anim.* 28, 54: *inde est quod etiam pueri vagientes, quanto alieniores a ratione sunt, tanto facilius discernunt sensu etiam contactum coniunctionemque nutricum, nec odorem aliarum possunt sustinere, cum quibus consuetudo non fuit*. — **gerulam**: this word, which occurs for the first time in Plin. *n. h.* and Apul., and is particularly frequent in Hier., is also found in 46, 9 and *adv. Marc.* 3, 13 (396, 16, = *adv. Iud.* 9, 41).

9. **iudicium** should almost certainly be interpreted as an accus. "whence should it have the ability to judge?" (the nomin. would mean: "whence has it the ability to judge?"; see the note on 25, 6). — **Unde illi . . . demulceri?**: similarly, *c. Chr.* 12, 14: *unde illi scire . . . ?*; see also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 71 and Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 19. — **affectiosa**: Tp, which also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 5, 14 (625, 23; Rom. 12, 10: φιλόστοργοι, Vulg. *diligentes*). — Here again the *argumentum ex scriptura sacra* is added at the end of the chapter (see the Introduction, ch. IV). Instead of **lactantium** B and Gel. have **lactentium**, probably after the example of the Vulgate (Ps. 8, 3; Matth. 21, 16): *ex ore infantium et lactentium perfecisti laudem* (*lactentium* is also found in quotations of these texts in Iren. lat. 1, 8, 9; 4, 21, 3; Aug. *confess.* 13, 15, 17). In the classical period *lactere* is more usual, though *lactare* is also found in this sense (Liv. Andronic., Varro, Ovid: see Keil's note on Varro *r. r.* 2, 4, 17). After Ovid the latter verb does not occur with the meaning found here before the *Itala*, viz. Matth. 21, 16 in the *codd.* Veron. Corbei. German. Brix. Rehdiger. Fuld. (*Amiat. lactentium*); cf. Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 623 and Sem., 3, 54, who wrongly refers to *exh. cast.* 9, 43 and *mon.* 16, where *lactantibus* (Matth. 24, 19) serves as a translation for ταῖς θηλαζούσαις, Vulg. *nutrientibus*. The usage in the classical period is defined by Serv. *ad Verg. Georg.* 1, 315: *et sciendum inter lactantem et lactentem hoc interesse, quod lactans est quae lac praebeat, lactens cui praebetur*. — **vim sensit**: Reifferscheid's conjecture *eum* does not seem to be right, though the contrast with the preceding *ei* may support it. Tert. means that the little children killed at Bethlehem, though they could not testify in favour of Christ, as was done by the *pueritia*, and so demonstrate that they possessed *intellectus*, at least must have been in possession of *sensus*: for whosoever underwent such violence cannot but have felt it at all events; it is the violence which in this case makes the existence of the *sensus* unquestionable. A different interpretation of this passage is given by Ambros. *expos. evang. Luc.* 2, 49 (69, 4/5 Schenkl): *expers licet sensus infantia deum tamen, pro quo interimitur, confitetur*.

20. *The uniformity of the human soul in general in spite of the divergent developments of individual souls.*

"All natural qualities of the soul are present in it, because they are inherent in its substance and develop along with it, as is also said by Seneca; in these qualities *intellectus* is included (§ 1). Similarly, seeds of fruit have only one definite form, viz. the form belonging to their kind, whereas their growth is different, in accordance with external circumstances (§ 2). It is in this way that souls too are affected by external factors, for instance *environment*: it is generally believed that people born in Thebes are stupid, whereas the inhabitants of Athens are considered to be particularly clever (on the other hand, Empedocles deduces stupidity and intelligence from the quality of the blood). In this context we may also refer to national characteristics, such as the timidity of the Phrygians, the unreliability of the inhabitants of Mauritania, the savageness of the Dalmatians, and the mendacity of the Cretans (§ 3). The condition of the *body* and the state of *health* also have some influence: obesity stunts the faculty of thinking and paralysis shatters the mind, whereas phthisis leaves it intact. Other factors affecting the evolution of the soul are still more to be regarded as external, as for instance study and exercise on one side, idleness and sin on the other, and all other powers, which may affect the soul, (§ 4), viz., according to us Christians, God and the devil, according to popular belief, fate, fortune, and free will (§ 5). So we must take into account quite a number of external forces operating upon the evolution of individual souls; usually the effects of this operation are wrongly regarded as inherent in the nature of the soul, whereas in reality they are no more than additional elements of its nature. For by the 'nature of the soul' we understand the soul which God bestowed upon Adam, making it the mother of all souls, and we may be sure that the variety of qualities possessed by individual souls to-day was not found in Adam's soul (§ 6)".

The demonstration of the uniformity of souls, which implies that the soul is in possession of all its natural faculties from the very beginning of its existence, is the natural consequence of the polemical discussion found in the preceding chapter; besides, it was dictated to Tert. by his continual considering of the *forma primordii* (see the note on 9, 7): only faculties already present in Adam's soul could be regarded as *naturalia animae*. On account of these considerations Tert. is not likely to have borrowed the structure and the chief contents of this chapter from any sources, especially not, because the subject discussed here is by no means a common one in ancient psychology.

The first paragraph is no more than a recapitulation of ch. 19, joined to a quotation from Seneca which may have been known to Tert. from his own reading. In § 3 the note referring to Thebes and Athens was almost certainly borrowed from Cic. *de fato* (see the comm.); two passages from Sallust may have been taken directly

from this author. On the other hand, the account concerning Empedocles may derive from Soranus, similar information being found in 15, 5, which passage was surely borrowed from Περὶ ψυχῆς; the same applies to the contents of § 4, in which the state of health and some diseases are discussed. As to the quotations from Plato in § 3, it is not possible to decide whether Arius or Albinus should be regarded as the intermediary (see the Introduction, p. 41*). In § 5 various notions are mentioned which at this time must have strongly engaged Tert.'s mind, as he was at work on (or had just finished) his treatise *De fato*.

1. This paragraph contains a recapitulation of ch. 19: all natural faculties of the soul are present in it from the beginning of its existence, so the *intellectus* is not added afterwards. **Substantivus** is a Tp. *naturalia* frequently occurs in Tert. in the sense of "qualities or faculties inherent in the nature (or substance) of the soul" (in *de anim.*: 22, 1; 24, 4. 5. 6; 32, 9; 38, 1; 43, 9). From Celsus downwards the usual sense of *naturalia* is 'genitals'. — **censetur**: 'comes into existence'. This use of *censeri* is not found before Tert.; it has been derived from the meaning 'to be regarded as present (or existing)', which meaning is often still perceptible, e. g. *pud.* 11 (241, 12/4): *Christiana enim disciplina a novatione testamenti . . . censetur* and *mon.* 11: *a fide enim etiam ipsa vita nostra censetur*. In this sense it is frequently joined on to the prepositions *ex* (*testim. anim.* 5 (140, 19/20): *naturae maiestatem, ex qua censetur auctoritas animae*; *anim.* 32, 2; *v. v.* 5; in the *Thes.* 1. L. this passage and 16, 5: *non semper ex irrationali censenda sunt indignativum et concupiscentivum* are wrongly taken to be similar) and *de* (*c. Chr.* 22, 38; *exh. cast.* 5, 22; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 48 (*apol.* 15, 6); *praescr.* 22, 2/3). Cf. also *mon.* 4; *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (319, 15); *apol.* 12, 5; a transitional case is found in *adv. Marc.* 2, 3 (336, 26/7): (*bonitatem*) *quasi exinde censendam, quo coepit operari*. The verb is joined on to *in* in 40, 1 (see the note), *mon.* 6: *isti* (sc. patriarchae) *itaque sunt, ut opinor, in quibus censeor*, and *ib.* 5. Afterwards (the material of the *Thes.* 1. L. is rather scanty here) this use of *censeri* is mostly found in works of authors influenced by Tert., e. g. *Cypr. ad Fort.* 11 (338, 19 H.); *de mort.* 14 (306, 4); *ad Demetr.* 26 (370, 19); *Arnob.* 1, 13; 2, 16; *Hier. c. Ioann. Hieros.* 27: *quae . . . his censentur elementis* (cf. *anim.* 32, 2); *ib.* 22; *ep.* 60, 8: *ab eo tempore censemur, ex quo in Christo renascimur*; [*Orig.*] *tract. de script. sacr.* 7 (77, 2 Batiffol-Wilmart). From other authors I can only quote *Optat. Milev. de schism. Donat.* 5, 1 and *schol. Cic. Bob.* p. 121, 17 Hild. — **Seneca saepe noster = Christianus** (see the note on 2, 1). For the influence of Seneca on Tert., see the Introduction, p. 46*. Probably Tert. here quotes from memory, as in *Sen. (de benef.* 4, 6, 6) we read *omnium aetatum omniumque artium*. — **seminibus**: of course this has nothing to do with the λόγος σπερματικός, a notion completely alien to Tert. (see H. Meyer, *Die Lehre von den Keimkräften*). — The words **occultis per infantiam** refer to the discussion in 19, 3, *intellectus* to the entire chapter. The quotation from Seneca is carefully commented upon, the more impor-

tant words being repeated. A correct paraphrase is given by Esser, 37: "Alles, was die menschliche Seele als Substanz dieser Art im Unterschiede von allen anderen konstituiert, und alles, was sich mit Notwendigkeit aus ihrer Natur ergibt (Wesen und wesentliche Eigenschaften), muss ihr naturaliter d. h. in dem Sinne zukommen, dass sie ohne dasselbe nicht sein und gedacht werden kann und muss ihr, weil in ihrem Begriffe liegend, vom Augenblicke ihres Ursprungs an unverlierbar innewohnen". Tert. uses Seneca's words *producit ingenia* as a proof for his assertion that the *intellectus* is inherent in the soul from the beginning.

2. The use of **respondent** instead of *spondent*, which is extremely rare, is due to the clausula (1 γ). For *re-* as a meaningless addition, see the note on 46, 2. — **degenerant**: cf. frag. Fuld. 6: *etiam fructibus a semine degenerare contingit*. — *eventu*: see the note on 2, 1. — For *licebit* instead of *licet*, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 38 and Hofm., *Synt.*, 738, for the ellipsis, Thierry, 131. — *et . . . interest*: it does not seem right to follow Thörn. (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 83) in regarding *et . . . etiam* as a pleonasm; we should translate: "for here too we also find environment <among other relevant factors>". For further details about this pleonasm in Tert., see Thörn., *loc. cit.*, Löfst., *Spr. Tert.*, 36/7, Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 72 and *Beitr.*, 118, and in general Hofm., *Synt.*, 662 and Thes. I. L. V, 2: 915, 15 *seqq.*; Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 7 *seqq.*; Löfst., *Spätlat. Stud.*, 32, *Synt.*, 2, 220, *Verm. Stud.*, 66/7, and *Per.*, 59. 95; Keil's note on Varro *r. r.* 2, 11, 3; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 73; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 334/5; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 491; Tidn., *de part. copulat.*, 121 and *Did.*, 48; Bonnet, 313/4; Bendz, *Cael.*, 60; Linde, 62; A. Erikson, 115; Norberg, 2, 209/10. As to the sense, see the note on 1, 2: *etsi nihil de loco interest*.

3. For theories concerning the influence of the dwelling-place and the climate on the soul and the mind, a subject discussed throughout antiquity since [Hippocr.] *de aere aq. loc.*, see the excellent, though not yet complete, monograph by K. Trüdinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie* (Basel 1918); ample material is also to be found in Förster's edition of the *Scriptores physiognomici*. It is not probable that Tert. for this passage consulted a special treatise on this subject or that he took all details from Soranus (see the Introduction, p. 35*); at all events, the quotation from Cic. *de fato* (see the next note) must be due to his own reading, as at this time he was composing a treatise *de fato* himself. — **Thebis**, etc.: this has been borrowed from Cic. *de fato* 4, 7: *Athenis tenue caelum, ex quo etiam acutiores putantur Attici, crassum Thebis: ilaque pingues Thebani et valentes*. As to the Thebans, see also Nepos *Alcib.* 11, 3; Hor. *ep.* 2, 1, 244 and Porphyrio's comm.; Boeckh's note on Pind. *Olymp.* 6, 153: Βοιωτίαν ὕν; Otto, *Sprichw.*, 56. — **sapiendi dicendique acutissimos**: probably referring to 3, 1: *sapientiae atque facundiae carpones*. For the genit. after *acutus*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 21 *seqq.* and 55. — **penes Colyttum** probably refers to Plato's birth-place (Diog. Laërt. 3, 3). —

mense citius: this fact is mentioned nowhere else; perhaps we may quote Philostrat. *Vit. Sophist.* 2, 5, 3 (80, 17 *seqq.* Kayser): καὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην . . . δοῦναί οἱ . . . δύο . . . ἐκ Κολλυτοῦ παιδία ψελλιζόμενα, ἐπειδὴ ἤκουεν αὐτὸν χαίροντα νέαις φωναῖς. — **praecoca** (A) is the correct reading; -cus (from Colum. downwards) also occurs in *pall.* 1, 2; *ad nat.* 1, 15, 8; *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (388, 23) and 4, 27 (514, 11). — **in Timaeo**: 24 C/D: ταύτην οὖν δὴ τότε ξύμπασαν τὴν διακόσμησιν καὶ σύνταξιν ἣ θεὸς προτέρους ὑμᾶς διακοσμήσασα κατόφισεν, ἐκλεξαμένη τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ γεγέννησθε, τὴν εὐκρασίαν τῶν ὥρων ἐν αὐτῇ κατιδοῦσα, ὅτι φρονιμωτάτους ἄνδρας οἴσοι· ἅτε οὖν φιλοπόλεμός τε καὶ φιλόσοφος ἣ θεὸς οὔσα τὸν προσφερεστάτους αὐτῇ μέλλοντα οἴσειν τόπον ἄνδρας, τοῦτον ἐκλεξαμένη πρώτον κατόφισεν (cf. *Crit.* 109 C). The passage is also quoted by Galen in a special treatise on this subject (*anim. mor. corp. temp.* 9 = IV, 806 Kühn). — **in Legibus**: Tert. certainly has in mind the beginning of the fourth book (704 B *seqq.*), where Clinias describes the site of the new city to be founded in Crete. — The reading **procurare** (A) is to be retained, an infinitive being frequently found after *praecipere* in late Latin (from Curtius downwards): cf. Gabarrou, 138; von Geisau, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 36 (1916), 271; Goelz., *Jér.*, 372; Juret, *Filistr.*, 117. — **Empedocles**: in a modern treatise a sentence like this, which interrupts the course of the discussion, viz. the influence of the surroundings on the mind, would be relegated to a footnote. Cf. 15, 5; Theophrast. *frag. de sens.* 10/1 (D D G 502, 13 *seqq.*): διὸ καὶ τῷ αἵματι μάλιστα φρονεῖν· ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ μάλιστα κεκρᾶσθαι [ἔστι] τὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν μερῶν. ὅσοις μὲν οὖν ἴσα καὶ παραπλήσια μέμικται καὶ μὴ διὰ πολλοῦ μὴδ' αὖ μικρὰ μὴδ' ὑπερβάλλοντα τῷ μεγέθει, τούτους φρονιμωτάτους εἶναι καὶ κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀκριβεστάτους; [Aristot.] *physiogn.* § 72 p. 86, 4 *seq.*; *phys. lat.* § 2 p. 4, 4 *seq.* and § 12 p. 20, 11 *seq.*; [Plut.] *strom.* 10 (D D G 582, 15/7). — **argutus** is used here for the first time referring to mental faculties (Thes. I. L. II: 558, 22/7). — **perfectum**: a very rare word, which occurs for the first time in Vitruv. (see Rönsch, *It.*², 91 and A. L. L. 8, 526). As far as I know, the latter view of Empedocles is mentioned nowhere else. — **res . . . proprietatum**: “the theme of national characteristics”; *res proprietatum* is almost equivalent to *proprietates*. See for this use of *res* in Tert., Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 21 and Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 96/7, for other authors, Gabarrou, 88/9; Blomgren, *Stud. Fortun.*, 2, 55; Fassbender, 47₁; Mossberg, 59; Axelson, *Alex.*, 16. — **Phrygas**: it is not clear whether Tert. here refers to Greek or to Roman comedies (from Plautus and Terence no perfect parallels can be quoted). Cf. Eur. *Orest.* 1351: Φρύγας καχούς; *ib.* 1447; Herondas 2, 100/1 (see for this passage, O. Crusius, *Unters. zu den Mimiamben des Herondas* (Leipsic 1892), 49); Serv. in Verg. *Aen.* 1, 273: (Vergilius Troianos) *ut limidos Phrygas* (sc. appellat), *ut nobiles Dardanides*; *id.* in 1, 468; Kroll's note on Cic. *orat.* 25. The present passage has been imitated by Hier. *ad Galat.* 3, 1: . . . ob id, quod unaquaeque provincia suas habeat proprietates. Cretenses semper mendaces, malas bestias, ventres pigros vere ab Epimenide poeta dictos apostolus comprobat. Vanos Mauros et feroces Dalmatas Latinus pulsat

historicus. Timidos Phrygas omnes poetae (an obvious correction of Tert.'s words) *lacerant. Athenis expeditiora nasci ingenia* (this expression was borrowed from 25, 7) *philosophi gloriantur*. — *vanos Mauros*: *histor. frag.* 1,63 Kritz (not found in Maurenbrecher's edition of the fragments): *Maurique, vanum genus*. Cf. *Amm. Marc.* 30, 7, 10: *ad omnes dissensionum motus perflabiles gentes Mauricas*; *Prud. apoth.* 433: *Atlantis . . . plaga perfida Mauri*. — *feroces Dalmatas*: *hist.* 2, frag. 39 Maurenbrecher: *genus armis ferox et servitii insolitum*; cf. *Amm. Marc.* 26, 4, 4: *Ursatio . . . Delmatae crudo*; *Florus* 4, 12, 10 (copied by *Iordan. Roman.* 244). — *pulsat* = *accusat, taxat*; see the note on 40, 4. — *mendaces Cretas*: the verse ascribed to Epimenides: Κρητες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργοί is usually connected by Christian authors with Callim. *hymn. in Iov.* 8/9: Κρητες ἀεὶ ψεύσται καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὧ ἄνα, σεῖο/Κρητες ἐτεκτῆναντο· σὺ δ' οὐ θάνες (this verse may be levelled at Euhemerus: see Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 130₁); *Tatian. orat.* 27; *Athenag. legat.* 30; *Clem. Alex. protr.* 2, 37 (*Epiphan.* 42 = 362 B); *Orig. c. Cels.* 3, 43 (see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 227/8); for Theodoretus and Theodorus of Mopsuestia (who certainly follow Callimachus), see Dibelius' note on *Tit.* 1, 12 (*Hdb. N. T.* 13, p. 86). Cf. also *Orig. homil. in Levit.* 5, 7; *Select. in Jerem.* frag. 27 (p. 212 *Klosterm.*); *homil. in Luc.* 31; *Hier. ep.* 70, 2, 2; *ad Tit.* 1, 12; *ad Galat.* 4, 24; *Acta Apollonii* 22; *Clem. Alex. strom.* 1, 14, 59, 2; *Pelag. ad Tit.* 1, 12 (who on the words *dixit quidam* remarks: *Parmenides* (many manuscripts, however, have *epimenides*!) *sive Callimachus*); *Otto, Sprichw.*, 98 and *G. Wolff, Porphyr. de philos. ex orac. haur. libr. reliq.* (Berlin 1856), 52. — *inurit*, sc. *nota turpitudinis*, cf. e. g. *Cic. pro Cluentio* 46, 129: *ensoriae severitatis nota non inuretur*? The verb usually governs a dat. and accus., e. g. *Cic. de provinc. consul.* 7, 16: (ignominia) *uni . . . inusta*; *Catull.* 25, 11 (see Kroll's note); *Tert. apol.* 39, 7: *sed eiusmodi vel maxime dilectionis operatio notam nobis inurit penes quosdam*. The pregnant use, which does not seem to occur before Tert., may be due to the example of *notare* (see the note on 40, 2); cf. the translation of 1 *Tim.* 4, 2 κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν in *iei.* 2 (276, 8/9): *inustam habentes conscientiam* (*Vulg. conteriatam*). As far as I know, the only other passages in which this pregnant use is found are [*Orig.*] *tract. de script. sanct.* 6 (66, 7/8 *Batiff.-Wilm.*): *arguit et inurit*, and 17 (182, 5/6): *vitia carnis denotet et inurat*.

4. *Fortassean*: see the note on 5, 1. — *valetudine*: there is no reason to follow B in inserting *de* before this word, as the two notions *corpore* and *valetudine* are closely connected; cf. e. g. *adv. Iud.* 2, 48: *de aequitate et iustitia*, and the repetition of this passage in 24, 4: *pro corpulentis ac valetudinibus*. For more details, see Kroll's notes on *Cic. Brut.* 193 and *orat.* 38; *Landgraf on Rosc. Amerin.* 127. — *accedat*, viz. as an *accidens*, cf. the sequel: *quanto magis de accidentibus habebuntur*, etc.; see the note on 6, 5. — *Opimitas . . . impedit*: *com. Att. frag.* 1234 *Kock* (3, 613): *παχεῖα γαστήρ λεπτόν οὐ τίχτει νόον* (*Nauck frag. frag.* XV; *Galen V*, 878 *Kühn*; *Anon. Londin.* XVI, 3/4 *Diels*);

see Bücheler, *Rh. Mus.* 43 (1888), 295; Otto, *Sprichw.*, s. v. *venter* 1) (p. 363/4); Weyman, *A. L. L.* 8, 37; Leutsch, *Paroemiogr. Gr.*, 2, 337; Physiogn. Gr., ed. Förster, frag. 156. Schümmer (*Die altchristl. Fastenpraxis*, 210,) rightly supposes this sentence to be due in the first place to Tert.'s Montanism; numerous parallels (also to the words *exilitas expedit*) may be quoted from the treatise *de ieiunio*, e. g. 6 (280, 27/30; 281, 19/21). *opimitas* is an archaism (Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 35/6; Fessler, 53). — **prodigit**: see the note on 48, 1. — **pthisis** (A) is the correct reading, cf. W. Schulze, *Orthographica* (1894); Lindsay, *Latin language*, § 60. As far as I know, the well-known fact that pthisis does not injure the mind is never mentioned in Greek medical literature. — **de accidentibus habebuntur**: "should be counted among the *συμβεβηκότα*"; for this use of *de*, see the note on 24, 5. — **citra** is equivalent here to *extra*, *praeter*, a meaning seldom found (from Quint. *declam. min.* 278 (134, 8) downwards: *illa profecto citra interrogationem sunt*; see Thes. l. L. III: 1205, 50 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 509; Wack., *Synt.*, 2, 234; Rönsch, *It.*², 392; Gabler, 56; Parriger, 63/4); in Tert. it is frequent (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 37; cf. also 43, 6: *citra naturam*; *adv. Marc.* 5, 3 (574, 13); *scorp.* 13 (175, 18; = 2 Cor. 11, 24): *quinquies quadragenas citra unam*, *παρὰ μίαν*, Vulg. *una minus*). — **valentiam**: an archaism (Naev., Titin.) particularly frequent in Tert.'s works in quotations from Holy Scripture; see Rönsch, *It.*², 51; Axelson, *Alex.*, 15; Fassbender, 3. — **doctrinae . . . studia**: it seems preferable to connect *artes* with *experientiae* instead of assuming two tricola: firstly, the next sentence does not consist of two parts either, secondly, not only *doctrinae* and *disciplinae* (24, 4), *artes* and *disciplinae* (10, 1; 46, 11), *negotia* and *studia* (17, 11), but also *artes* and *studia* (24, 4; cf. also the enumeration occurring in 17, 11), which, if we adopt the latter interpretation, should be separated from each other, are often connected by Tert. The plural *experientiae* is of course due to the preceding plurals (cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 88/91; Hofm., *Synt.*, 371; Kroll's note on Catull. 3, 1; 63, 65); the same is found in 24, 4 (see the comm.). — **inexperientiae**: a *ἄ. λ.*, which is due to the antithesis. — **aliquae**: this conjecture by Mercerus is necessary. A B Gel have *si et alia quae praesunt potestates*, which is impossible, the relative clause in this passage being much too positive ('the dominating powers') to be introduced by *si et alia* ('if there should be still other factors'). The reading *si et aliae quae* proposed by me in the first edition is refuted by the fact that in this case Tert. would certainly have written (*et*) *si quae aliae*, cf. e. g. *pud.* 19 (265, 23/5): *homicidium, idololatria, fraus, . . . et si qua alia violatio templi*; *adv. Prax.* 11 (243, 12); *scorp.* 1 (145, 29 *seqq.*); Gerlo, 2, 22. So the best solution is to follow Mercerus and to interpret *aliquis* as equivalent to *alius quis*, as in *apol.* 23, 7: *magia aut aliqua eiusmodi fallacia*. According to Löfst. (*Beitr.*, 115), the earliest instance of this use occurs in Petron. 10, 6; however, we may certainly quote Caes. *bell. Gall.* 6, 16, 5: *qui in furto aut latrocinio aut aliqua noxia sint comprehensi*, and probably already Enn. *scen.* 243: *cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod beluarum* (a different interpretation is given by Frobenius, 16: "überhaupt

irgend ein") and Plaut. *Rud.* 135. 766 (see Sonnenschein's note); on the other hand, there may doubt about the interpretation of Varro *l. l.* 6, 37 (71, 21 Goetz-Schoell), where this meaning is assumed by Canal. For more instances, see Skutsch, *Kl. Schr.*, 205₁; Tidn., *De partic. copul.*, 2₁; Sjögren, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 133/4; Ahlquist, 127; Seyffert-Müller, *Cic. Laelius*, 247. 495; Kroll's notes on *Cic. Brutus* 143 and 310; Armini, *Eran.* 26 (1928), 275 (*ullus* = *ullus alius* in Apul.). Svenberg (110/1) quotes several passages in which *aliquis* has become completely equivalent to *alius*. This interpretation is contested by Waltz., *Ét.*, 337 and Vollmer (Thes. l. l. I: 1608, 73 *seqq.*: "... cum aliqua vi opponendi, ita tamen ut nusquam aliquis sit i. q. *alius quis* (licet glossae vertant ἑτέρος τις, ἄλλος τις); immo hoc aut ipsum ponitur ... aut *alius aliquis*"). The latter rightly points out that *aliquis* in this sense (or, as he formulates it, "cum aliqua vi opponendi ponitur") is nearly always preceded by *aut* or *vel*; the only exception quoted by him is similar to the present passage, viz. Ovid *her.* 12, 79/80: *per ... sacra Dianae / et si forte aliquos gens habet ista deos*. Perhaps we may also adduce Ovid. *met.* 3, 644; *obstipui 'capiat' que 'aliquis moderamina' dixi* (a helmsman is speaking!; however, cf. Ehwald's note). — *praesunt*: sometimes this verb in Tert.'s works is almost equivalent to *praesto esse*; that this is not the case here is evident from the repetition in 24, 4 (see the comm.): *pro potestatibus dominatricibus*. Yet it is not correct, as was done by Waltzing (*comm.* 306), to maintain that *praeesse* may become completely synonymous to *praesto esse*; in *res.* 14 (42, 27): *causa restitutionis praeesse debet* the original meaning still obtains (the genit. is used instead of the dat., see the note on 6, 3); this becomes particularly clear, if we compare this passage with 43, 7: *somnum ratio praeit* (Tert. has a tendency to personify the notion 'ratio', cf. e. g. 17, 10 *illa ratio ... quae efficiat*; 56, 1 *an quasdam animas aliqua ratio detineat hic interim*). The same is found in *c. Chr.* 17, 10: *ratio, quae praefuit, ut dei filius de virgine nasceretur* and *apol.* 48, 2: *si quaecumque ratio praest animarum humanarum reciprocandarum in corpora*; in *apol.* 21, 11: (*spiritus*) *cui et sermo insit pronuntianti et ratio adsit disponenti et virtus praesit perficienti*, the choice of *praeesse* is due to parallelism. In *scorp.* 6 (156, 5/6): *hic quoque liberalitas magis quam acerbitas dei praest* the meaning is "to be present as the most important factor". A parallel to the use of the genit. instead of the dat. in these passages is furnished by *ad nat.* 2, 8, 4: *nam quae idonea auctoritas praecucurrit eiusmodi theologiae?*

5. *aemulus*, sc. *dei*, cf. *cor.* 6, 13; *pat.* 5 (6, 18); 16 (23, 20/1); *iei.* 16 (296, 11); *spect.* 2 (4, 8); *bapt.* 5, 3; *paen.* 5, 7. 9; *praescr.* 40, 4; *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 3; *mart. Polyc.* 17, 1 ὁ ... ἀντίζηλος; for Athenagoras, see Lortz, *Tert.*, 2, 37. — *providentia ... libertas*: a decision about the correct form of the text is particularly difficult, because the treatise *De fato*, to which Tert. refers here, got lost. A has *providentiae fatum et necessitas et fortunae arbitrii libertas* (this reading was adopted by Oehler, who inserts *et* before *providentiae*), B *et providentiae fatum*

et necessitas et fortunae et arbitrii libertas, Gel. *et providentia et fatum et necessitas et fortuna et arbitrii libertas*. Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 3, 32/3) follows A, but puts the second *et* after *fortunae*, which gives a trichotomy: *providentiae fatum et necessitas fortunae et arbitrii libertas*; for the combination *necessitas fortunae*, he refers to Hor. *carm.* 1, 35, 17: *te* (sc. *Fortuna*) *semper anteit saeva Necessitas*. However, this reference is not sufficient to make it probable that Tert. indeed wrote *necessitas fortunae*, which, unlike *necessitas fati* (e. g. Cic. *de fato* 20. 22. 38. 39; see Thes. 1. L. VI: 366, 77/80), is found nowhere else (cf. Thes. VI: 1190). Since, on the other hand, in *res.* 58 (118, 25/6) we read: *ubi necessitas aut quod dicitur fortuna vel fatum?*, it seems preferable not to connect *necessitas* with another substantive. This makes it seem probable that Gelenius was right in assuming that Tert. gives an enumeration of substantives here, and that we should moreover separate *fatum* from *providentia*; to support this conjecture, we may refer to the enumerations in § 4. Moreover, Tert. clearly states that the conceptions which are mentioned in this passage are much discussed by pagan philosophers; cf. such passages as Maxim. Tyr. *diss.* 5, 4: τῶν ὅσα οἱ ἄνθρωποι εὐχονται γενέσθαι . . . τὰ μὲν ἡ πρόνοια (*providentia*) ἐφορᾷ, τὰ δὲ εἰμαρμένη (*fatum*) καταναγκάζει (*necessitas*), τὰ δὲ μεταβάλλει ἡ τύχη (*fortuna*), τὰ δὲ οἰκονομεῖ ἡ τέχνη. It also recalls numerous passages in the *Corpus Hermeticum* (Tert. puts the writings of *Mercurius Aegyptius* on a level with philosophy, see 15, 5), where a distinction is made between πρόνοια, εἰμαρμένη, and ἀνάγκη, e. g. *Exc.* XIV (p. 436 Scott): καὶ ἡ μὲν διακρατοῦσα τὸν ὅλον κόσμον πρόνοια ἐστίν · ἡ δὲ συνέχουσα καὶ περιέχουσα ἀνάγκη ἐστίν. εἰμαρμένη δὲ ἄγει καὶ περιάγει πάντα, κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐνεργοῦσα · φύσις γὰρ ἐστίν αὐτῆς τὸ ἀναγκάζειν; 12, 14b (232, 2/3 Scott); 12, 21: μέρη ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμαρμένη καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ πρόνοια καὶ φύσις (see Scott's notes, II, p. 358/9 and III, p. 419). Of Christian authors (who, however, for this passage are not of primary importance) Tatian. should be specially mentioned, who regards the εἰμαρμένη as the work of the demons (e. g. *orat.* 9 = 9, 23/4 Schwartz), and opposes it to the θεῖα πρόνοια (for the highly complicated doctrine of Athénagoras on this subject, see Andres, *Engellehre*, 168/9); similarly, in *Aug. civ. dei* 5, 1 the *providentia divina* is opposed to *fatum* and *fortuna*. It may be supposed that Tert. in his monograph followed Tatianus in refuting the identification of *providentia* and *fatum* (for which cf. e. g. Apul. *de Plat.* 1, 12: *si quid providentia geritur, id agitur et fato, et quod fato terminatur, providentia debet susceptum videri*; other confutations of the pagan doctrine of εἰμαρμένη are found in Justin *apol.* 1, 43; *dial. c. Tryph.* 88. 141; [Clem.] *recogn.* 9/10). The addition of *arbitrii libertas* is primarily due to the circumstance that this notion is discussed in the next chapter (similarly, in § 6 a conclusion referring to the next chapter is drawn with regard to Adam's soul; see the comm. *ad loc.*). — *arbitrii libertas*: cf. 21, 6: *liberam arbitrii potestatem quod αὐτεξούσιον dicitur*. Tert. also uses the expressions *libera hominis potestas arbitrii sui* (*adv. Marc.* 2, 6 = 341, 1/2) and *libertas et potestas arbitrii* (*ib.*, 1. 4 and 2, 8 = 345, 18/9; for the addition of *potestas*,

see Naumann, *Ztschr. f. kathol. Theol.* 58 (1934), 352₅₄); we also find *liberi arbitrii licentia* (Mar. Victorin. *ad Justin. Manich.* 16), *voluntatis suae liberum arbitrium* (Ambrosiaster in *Rom.* 11, 15), *arbitrii libera potestas* (Hier. *ad Ephes.* 5, 24), *libera arbitrii facultas* (Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandl. u. Pred.*, p. 203), *voluntatis propriae libertas* (ib.), *liberi arbitrii potestas* (Cassian. *institut. lib.* 12, 18, 1); as far as I know, the use of the simpler denotation *liberum arbitrium* was established by Augustine. — suo . . . titulo: 'a special treatise, a monograph'; see the note on 3, 4. — *vovimus* (A; *novimus* B Gel) is the correct reading, cf. e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 10, 190: *privatim dicato opere narranda* and Hier. *c. Ioann. Hieros.* 22: *alteri istud . . . operi dedicabimus*. A passage from the treatise *De fato* is quoted by Fulgent. *serm. antiq.* 16 (116, 18/20 Helm): *nam et Tertullianus in libro quem de fato scripsit ita ait: 'redde huic fratri primum problematis mancipatum'*. From the passage under discussion it does not follow that Tert. had already composed the treatise *De fato*, as was asserted by Harnack, *Chronol. altchrist. Lit.*, 2 (Leipsic 1904), 262; the words *haec . . . disserenda suo iam vovimus titulo* may just as well imply that Tert. had conceived the plan of devoting a monograph to this subject, to which he refers his readers in advance; the use of the gerundive *disserenda* supports this interpretation. See also Bardenhewer, *Lit.*, 2², 428 *seq.*, Krüger in Schanz, *Röm. Lit.*, 3³, 325, and H. Koch, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 101 (1929), 458 *seqq.* The last-mentioned scholar refers to the possibility (which, however, cannot be proved) that Tert.'s monograph was consulted by the author of [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 115 (p. 318/49 Souter).

6. *varie collocarint*: the interpretation of this expression should probably start from the meaning 'to invest money' (cf. e. g. Cic. *offic.* 2, 20, 71: *quamobrem melius apud bonos quam apud fortunatos beneficium collocari puto*), cf. § 2: *animam . . . fetu multiformem*. That Tert., as most Latin authors do, still bore in mind the original sense of *fenus* (τόκος), is shown by the metaphorical use of *fenerare* in 30, 2, which there, just as *collocare* in this passage, is equivalent to *augere*. — *quando*: the adversative sense found here does not seem to occur before Tert. (see Hofm., *Synt.*, 740; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 78/9). — *non species . . . sed sortes*: "no subspecies, but accidental qualities". *sortes* has the concrete meaning of *res quae sorte ad naturam animae accedunt*; cf. 43, 9: *de naturae sortibus = de illis quae natura nostra sortita est* and 11, 6: *ex substantiae suae sorte = ex substantia quam sortita est* (sc. anima). — *naturae et substantiae*: for these two notions, see the note on 9, 6. — *matricem*: cf. 19, 6. — *id est*: Rigaltius writes *ut et*; however, it is quite possible to retain the reading of A B Gel. Tert. had already proved (or thinks he had proved) in §§ 1/2 that the *natura animae*, though *fetu multiformis*, is *semine uniformis*; hence it follows that all qualities that are due to external influences are no more than *accidentia* and so not inherent in the soul. Here he draws a further conclusion from this statement with regard to the soul of Adam, which conclusion must serve as an introduction to chapter 21,

in which the 'uniformity' of Adam's soul will be upheld in opposition to Valentinus: "the *natura* or *substantia animae* may be identified with the soul of Adam; this means that, if all these *accidentia* are not inherent in the essence of the soul, they were no more present in Adam". The only difficulty (which also gave rise to Rigaltius' conjecture) rises from the fact that the conclusion is given in the form of a paraphrase (for this use of *id est*, cf. e. g. 35, 4: *Hoc est ex malis fructibus bonam arborem intellegi, id est ex pessimis praeceptis doctrinam veritatis agnoscere*, or 11, 3: *eis qui terram calcant id est opera carnis subigunt*). *Fuerit* should obviously be interpreted as a past future tense (cf. *erunt*), not as a *coni. potentialis* (in this case Tert. uses the subjunctive of the perfect tense in the first person only, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 67). The last sentence, which for the sense is perfectly superfluous, contains the idea on which the paraphrase is based: "we are justified in saying that this variety of qualities cannot have been present in Adam: for they would have been present in him, because he is the 'source of all souls', if this variety was inherent in the nature of the soul". *varietas . . . moralis = varietas morum*; see the note on 43, 8. — **generis = generis humani**; this meaning is found from Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 63. 760. 1810. 1862 downwards. For further instances, see my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 17. Cf. also *mon.* 4: *in auctoribus generis*; *c. Chr.* 22, 8; *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (324, 28); 2, 11 (350, 14); 2, 15 (355, 17); *iei.* 3 (277, 22); *Arnob.* 7, 12; *Prud. Hamart.* 33 (wrongly explained by Stam in his edition, p. 142); *Petr. Chrysol. serm.* 156 (612 B) and 160 (621 B). For this passage, cf. 43, 9: *ille fons generis Adam*; *paen.* 2, 3: *a principe generis Adam*; *v. v.* 11; *exh. cast.* 2, 31. — **ut in fonte naturae**, sc. *animarum*. By representing Adam as the 'source of all souls', Tert. combats the Platonic conception of the κρατήρ τῶν ψυχῶν (*Tim.* 41 D), as is shown by 29, 2: *defecerat ille quicumque est origini fons*? Cf. also 22, 2 (25, 1): *quomodo ex una redundet (anima)*; 27, 9: *ex uno homine tota haec animarum redundantia*. This Platonic idea was also attacked by *Arnob.* 2, 25: *anima docta illa . . . affluens ex crateribus vivis*; *ib.* 2, 45; *Aug. de gen. ad litt.* 10, 7, 12: *in illo animarum fonte, si ullus est* and *ep.* 166, 12; *Theodoret. haer. fab.* 5, 9; *Altercatio S. Ambrosii* (*Kirchenhist. Anecd.*, ed. Caspari, p. 229): *cesset Plato qui dicit fontem esse animarum*. A very remarkable statement is found in *Filastr.* 126, 1: "according to the philosophers, souls originate *nunc de aqua, nunc de spiritu, nunc de materia, nunc de fonte, nunc de atomis* (see for this passage *Introduction*, p. 11*). In Tert.'s time this conception was generally known; cf. *Apul. de Plat.* 1, 9: *illam, fontem animarum omnium, caelestem animam*; *Corp. Herm.* 4, 4; for the later Platonists (*Proclus*, *Hermippus*, *Psellus*), see *Kroll, de orac. Chald.*, 25/6. 28. 76. From the beginning of the fourth century Christian authors also use this image, e. g. *Mar. Victorin. ad Ephes.* 2, 15: *animae a dei fonte natae*; *Prud. cathem.* 10, 1: *deus, ignee fons animarum*; *ib.* 130; *Hamart.* 185; 819/20; *apoth.* 915/6; for parallels from Hebrew literature, see *R. Eisler, A R W* 17 (1914), 352. — **Debuerant . . . fuisse . . . manasse** instead of *esse . . . manare*; see for this *attractio*, *Hoppe, Synt.*, 53/4 and *Beitr.*, 40, and the note on 35, 3: *pactus es . . .*

renuntiasset. For *manasse*, cf. the use of *redundare* (-*antia*) in the passages quoted above and Zeno Veron. 1, 12, 1: *a quibus omne genus manavit humanum*; c. Chr. 22, 7/8: *his originis fontibus genere manante*.

21. *Confutation of the doctrine of Valentinus concerning the 'triformity' of souls and the immutability of human nature.*

"If the nature of the soul, as has just been demonstrated, was uniform in Adam, it cannot possibly have become multiform afterwards. Hence the 'triformity' of souls assumed by the Valentinians is impossible likewise; at all events, nothing of this kind is to be discovered in Adam (§ 1). A 'spiritual' element was absent from his soul; the fact that he uttered a prophecy concerning Christ and the Church should be explained in a different way (§ 2). The evil to which he was allured by the devil, for this very reason was not inherent in his nature (that it cannot have been a 'material' element of his being, was proved by us long ago). From this it follows that only the 'psychic' element was present in him; this, however, was simple and uniform, as we have already demonstrated (§ 3).

One question still remains to be discussed, viz. if this 'psychic' element is variable. The Valentinians presume that human nature is immutable, which they do for the purpose of 'fixing' their special trinity in three definite types of men. To support this view they adduce several scriptural texts; but to these we may oppose other texts which uphold the mutability of the soul (§ 4). From this, however, it does not follow that Holy Scripture contradicts itself. If the Valentinians say: "No bad tree bears good fruit", we add: "only if it is not improved", etc. (§ 5). This improvement is achieved by the grace of God, which is more powerful than nature; subject to this grace is free will, which is inherent in human nature and is changeable. But this has already been discussed in our refutation of Marcion and Hermogenes <= *De censu animae*> (§ 6). Things belonging to nature may be divided into two classes: born and unborn, created and uncreated things. Whatever has been born or created is changeable, as it may be born and created anew; whatever is unborn or uncreated, is immutable. Since, however, these qualities belong to God only, we are forced to conclude that, outside God, everything is changeable.

Therefore, if we should assume this 'trinity' for the soul in spite of all, it cannot possibly be part of its original nature (§ 7)".

The sources used in this chapter are firstly the circumstantial discussion of the *trinitas Valentiniana* by Iren. 1, 1, 10/1, secondly Tert.'s own expositions in earlier writings, especially *adv. Val.* 29 (204, 18 *seqq.*; it goes without saying that the latter passage also derives from Iren.): *triformem naturam primordio professi et tamen inunitam* (= *unitam*, cf. the note on 19, 3 *inornantur*) *in Adam, inde iam dividunt per singulares generum proprietates, nacti occasionem distinctionis huiusmodi ex posteritate ipsius Adae, moralibus quoque differentiis tripertita, Cain et Abel <et> Seth. <hos> fontes quodammodo generis humani in totidem derivant argumenta naturae atque sententiae:*

choicum (here: *materiale*), *saluti degeneratum*, *ad Cain redigunt*, *animale*, *mediae spei deliberatum*, *ad Abel componunt*, *spiritalē*, *certae saluti praeiudicatum*, *in Seth recondunt*. Sic et *animas ipsas duplici proprietate discernunt*, *bonas et malas*, *secundum choicum statum ex Cain et animalem ex Abel*. *spiritalē ex Seth de obvenientia superducunt iam non naturam sed indulgentiam* (= *donum*, cf. 14, 4 n.), *ut quam Acha-moth de superioribus in animas bonas depluat*, *id est animali censui inscriptas*. *choicum enim genus*, *id est malas animas*, *numquam capere salutaria*; *inmutabilem enim et inreformatilem naturae naturam pronuntiaverunt*; cf. also *ib.* 17 (196, 21/197, 2); *Exc. ex Theodoto* 56, 3; Hippolyt., frag. 3 in *Genes.*; Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 142.

Though it is probable that Soranus after the example of the Stoics also upheld the freedom of the will (Kärpp, 45), there is no particular reason to take his influence into account here, as this chapter contains nothing but a repetition of passages from earlier works of Tert.

1. The first sentence becomes clear only, if we keep in mind the end of the preceding chapter. When contending that the nature of the soul "is not multiform", Tert. means to say that of all existing souls there are no different classes; he does not attack the view that a single soul may be multiform (for the rest, this view would be still more unacceptable to him). The words *natura animae* denote the *summa animarum*, the sum total of the souls which have sprung from Adam. If the three classes postulated by Valentinus really existed, they should have been present in the soul of Adam, which hence should have been *triformis* (cf. 20, 6: *Debuerant . . . fuisset*). Since, however, nothing of this kind is to be discovered in Adam, the entire classification becomes invalid. — *quia uniformis*: this repetition is due to the wish to accentuate Tert.'s point of view; for more instances, see Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 74. — *adhuc*: according to Pamelius, the sense is 'once again' (viz. after *Adv. Valentin.*). This interpretation is possible, as *Adv. Valentin.* was probably composed before *De anima* (see the note on 11, 3). However, we may also regard *adhuc* as equivalent to *etiam*: "for the purpose of confuting the 'trinity' of Valentinus into the bargain". For this use of *adhuc*, cf. Waltz, *Ét.*, 355; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 110; Gerlo, 2, 115; Thes. l. L. I: 622, 61 *seqq.* — *caedatur*: similarly, 34, 1; *res.* 55 (113, 21/2): *causae . . . aliunde iam caesae*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 29 (375, 29) and 4, 1 (423, 7); cf. also Thes. l. L. III: 62, 47 *seqq.* The Greek Fathers often use κόπτειν in the same way, e. g. Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 13, 1 (640 C).

2. The interpretation of Gen. 2, 23/4 given here has been copied from 11, 4; for the qualification of ecstasy as *amentia*, see the comm. on ch. 45, p. 485.

3. *transgressionis admissum*: cf. 16, 1. In this passage Tert. wants to demonstrate that Adam's soul did not contain a 'material' element. The only thing which might be regarded as such, was his sin, the *transgressionis admissum*; as, however, it has been proved already

(in ch. 16) that this evil was not inherent in the nature of his soul, it is impossible to show in this way that this nature contained a *materiale*. As this proof still does not satisfy Tert., he adds a new argument: the evil cannot possibly have been a *materiale*, as nothing, not even evil, proceeds from matter (for more about this subject, see *adv. Herm.* 10/1). In the next sentence this is pointed out once again: "But, if neither the spiritual nor the so-called material element was present in him as part of his being (*proprium*), even if the germ of the evil should have proceeded from matter (for even then the material element would not yet be a part of Adam's soul, because evil does not belong to the *natura animae*), the psychic element only can have been present in him". The structure of the argument is very remarkable: Tert. immediately mentions the evil and says that it neither belonged to the nature of the soul nor had proceeded from matter; he omits the premiss that it is only the evil which might perhaps be considered to be both '*materiale*' and '*naturale*' and so bring about a connection between matter and the nature of the soul. For similar arguments, see the note on 6, 1. Of course it is completely wrong to follow Ursinus, Oehler, and Reifferscheid in putting a comma after *materia*; according to Tert., nothing proceeds from matter. For *et si*, cf. *adv. Herm.* 20 (148, 18/9): *quoniam, et si ex materia facturus fuisset* (deus), *ante in sophia cogitando et disponendo iam fecerat* (Kroymann wrongly puts the latter part of the sentence in parentheses); *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (339, 30 seq.): *nam et si ex aliqua materia, ut quidam volunt, hoc ipso tamen ex nihilo, dum non id fuerunt, quod sunt*; for more details, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 42/3. *instinctu*: cf. 16, 1. — *quia et materiae fidem iam exclusimus*, viz. in *adv. Herm.* 10/12. The adjective *materialis* is Tp. — *quod* = *id quod*, for *naturale* is the nominal part of the predicate. *censetur* = *vocatur, dicitur*. At first an ablative such as *nomine* or *titulo* is added to *censeri*, if it has this sense (the earliest instance is Val. Max. 8, 7 ext. 2; it is frequently used by Apul., cf. Thes. I. L. III: 789, 76 seqq.); from Tert. we may adduce *adv. Marc.* 4, 10 (446, 30): *ipso titulo filii hominis censetur Christus*; *mon.* 8; *pat.* 11 (17, 27); *apol.* 39, 8 *Fuld.* Tert. is the first author to omit the ablative here (Thes. 790, 28 seqq.); other instances occur in *ad ux.* 1, 6; *spect.* 6 (8, 12); *adv. Herm.* 7 (134, 9) and 36 (165, 13; the interpretation of these two passages is not quite certain); *pud.* 21 (271, 8); cf. Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 84; Waltz., *Ét.*, 339/40. As the Thes. I. L. is far from complete here, some passages may be added: Apul. *de mundo* 2 (139, 1 Thom.): (Phosphorus) *Iunonia immo Veneris stella censetur*; with an ablat.: Rufin.-Adamant. 5, 26; Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 4, 1, 1 and *de gen. imperf. lib.* 6, 26; Eucher. *instruct.* 2, *de nom.* 1 (141, 24 Wotke); Rufin.-Gregor. Nazianz. *orat.* 5, 15, 2; Hier. *in Isai.* 1, 1 seqq. (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 3: 101, 6); *in Abd.* 1, 13/4; *in Gal.* 6, 10; *tract. de divit.* 6, 3 (Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandl. u. Pred.*, p. 32). — *quod . . . defendimus*: viz. in 10, 1. For the double accus., see the note on 11, 1.

4. *demutabile*: Tp. — *Idem . . . naturam*: Iren. 1, 1, 11; *adv. Val.*

29 (205, 11/2): *inmutabilem enim et inreformatibilem naturae naturam pronuntiaverunt*. — *convertibilem*: Tp. — *proprietas*: not 'qualities', but 'natures': the three classes of souls assumed by the Valentinians are meant. For *proprietates*, cf. 9, 1. — *quia arbor . . . bonos*: Luc. 6, 43 is neither adduced by Iren. (who never quotes this text) nor by Tert. in *adv. Val.*; on the other hand, it plays a prominent part in the confutation of Marcion, who considered it a very important argument for his doctrine concerning the existence of two Gods (Harnack, *Marcion*, 194*/5* and 260*/1*, cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 26 seqq.): . . . *in creatorem interpretatus malam arborem malos fructus condentem, scilicet mala, alium deum praesumpsit esse debere in partem bonae arboris bonos fructus*; 2, 24 (368, 5 seqq.); 4, 17 (476, 7 seqq.); cf. also [Tert.] *adv. omn. haeres* 6 (223, 5 seqq.); Hippolyt. *refut.* 10, 19, 3; Orig. *de princ.* 2, 5, 4; Epiphan. *panar.* 44, 1; Filast. 45, 2; for some other passages, see Harnack, *op. cit.*, 260*). — For *ficus* as a plur. accus., cf. Thes. l. L. VI: 650, 56 seqq. and 651, 13/40. — *genimina*: a 'Christianism', occurring from *It.* (cod. 8) Matth. 3, 7 downwards. For *paenitentiae fructus*, cf. H. Koch, *Cyprian. Unters.*, 270/2. 482. 484. — *eratis*: in another quotation of this text (*pud.* 18 = 260, 10) Tert. writes *fuistis*. — *et . . . abluti estis*: *pud.* 16 (252, 31): *sed haec quidem fuistis, sed abluti estis*. For the joining quotations from Holy Scripture by *et* (we are not always able to decide, whether *et* belongs to the quotation or not, as is the case here with 1 Cor. 6, 11), cf. Tidn., *Did.*, 196/7.

5. *Sed . . . sanctae: fuga* 7, 2: *tanta diversitas sententiarum si non congruit divinae gravitati*; for similar passages from patristic literature, see d'Archambault's note on Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 65, 2. — *Non dabit . . . expuerint*: here Tert. repeats the argumentation occurring in *adv. Herm.* 12 (139, 5 seqq.): (let us suppose for a moment that matter by nature is bad, and God is good) *hoc loco dicet aliquis: ergo de lapidibus filii Abrahae non suscitabuntur, et genimina viperarum non facient paenitentiae fructum, et filii irae non fient filii pacis, si natura mutabilis non erit? temere ad ista exempla respicies, o homo. non enim competunt ad causam materiae, quae innata est, ea quae nata sunt, lapides et viperae et homines; horum enim natura habendo institutionem habere poterit et cessationem*. From this it follows that the scriptural texts quoted are considered by Tert. the most important proofs for the mutability of the human soul. — *si non inseratur*: these words were probably caused by Rom. 11, 17/24. A similar argument occurs in Aug. *c. Adimant.* 26: *mala ergo arbor fructus bonos facere non potest: sed ex mala fieri bona potest, ut bonos fructus ferat* (thereupon he quotes Ephes. 5, 8), and Eucher. *form.* 3 (18, 12/3 Wotke): *quidam . . . arborem hanc voluntatem hominis magis quam ipsum hominem accipiendam putant*. Hier. *ad Gal.* 6, 1/2 also seems to refer to the Valentinians (or to the Manichaeans?): *utamur hoc testimonio* (viz. Gal. 6, 1) *adversum haereticos, qui diversarum fingentes fabulas naturarum, aiunt spiritualement bonam esse arborem et nunquam malos afferre fructus* (on the contrary, the apostle says that the *spirituales*

also may fall into sin): *quod et nos quoque fatemur, et γοῖκοὺς spirituales fieri, si ad meliora revertantur*; cf. also *adv. Iovin.* 2, 25. Finally, cf. [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 127, 22: *sic enim est nativitas, quasi arbor quae inseritur: quia si bono surculo inseritur, melior fiet et bona dicetur; si vero malo surculo inseratur, deterior erit, et non bona, sed mala vocabitur.*

6. **vis divinae gratiae, potentior utique natura**: this statement may have been influenced by Tert.'s adherence to Montanism; cf. the note on 9, 3. — **habens . . . potestatem**: this formulation seems to have been copied by Novat. *de trin.* 31: *mediator . . . omnis creaturae subiectam sibi habens . . . potestatem.* — **quod . . . dicitur**: cf. 15, 1. *liberam . . . potestatem*: cf. 20, 5. — **natura convertitur**: Neander interprets *natura* as a nomin.: "wohin er sich wendet, wendet die Natur sich mit"; it may be preferable to regard it with Kellner and Hauschild as an ablat. The difference is, however, not very important (cf. Esser, 127₄), as in both cases we arrive at the conclusion that the nature of the soul is subject to change. The sentence contains a syllogism which may be paraphrased in this way: "A. Free will belongs to the nature of the soul. B. Free will is subject to change. C. Hence there exists a *naturale animae* which is subject to change". If in the next sentence we adopt the interpretation of Neander, we have an obvious sophism (which in Tert. is not at all surprising): "the change undergone by this *naturale animae* also refers to the nature of the soul <, hence the nature of the soul is subject to change>"; according to the explanation of Kellner and Hauschild, the form is slightly different: "a change undergone by free will is a natural change <and so bears upon the nature of the soul, which hence is to be considered as subject to change>". For this passage, cf. also Brandt, 63₃. — **Marcioni**: viz. in the fundamental exposition of this subject given in *adv. Marc.* 2, 5/9 (cf. also *exh. cast.* 2). — **Hermogeni**: viz. in *De censu animae*; for more details, see the Introduction, p. 13*.

7. This paragraph contains a new argument in favour of the mutability of the nature of the soul; it was borrowed from *adv. Herm.*, where Tert. demonstrated that only God, not matter, is *innatus* and *infectus*; cf. ch. 5/7 and 12 (139, 12 *seqq.*). — **constiterit** is not to be interpreted as an impersonal verb, as is shown by the next sentence: *innatum . . . immobile stabit*. A parallel is furnished by *iei.* 16 (296, 10): *hinc divina* (sc. abstinentia) *constabit* (cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 45₁). *inconvertibili* (also *c. Chr.* 3, 25) is Tp. — **soli deo**: cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 3 (293, 22/3): *deum summum esse magnum in aeternitate constitutum, innatum, infectum, sine initio, sine fine* (for the text, cf. Bill, 21). — **absolutum est = certum est**. According to Thes. l. L. I: 178, 53 *seqq.*, this sense is not found before Tert. To the instances adduced there we may add *v. v.* 8, 11; *adv. Marc.* 2, 21 (364, 16); cf. *absolute = certo* 29, 4. — **accidentiae**: cf. the note on 11, 4. — **ex institutione naturae = ex natura instituta**, just as in 11, 6: *ex substantiae suae sorte = ex substantia quam sortita est* (sc. anima). To understand the words *etsi . . . deputaretur*, which

again refer to the soul of Adam, we must adduce the discussion of the *accidentia spiritus sancti et sp. mali* occurring in 11, 4/5. "If we ascribe a *trinitas* to the soul <of Adam>, in other words, if we say that this soul also contained a 'spiritual' and a 'material' element, we should not lose sight of the fact that both these elements, viz. his ecstasy (11, 4) and his sin (21, 3), were no more than *accidentiae* (11, 4: *etsi Adam . . . prophetavit . . . accidentiam spiritus passus est*; 11, 5: *et malus spiritus accidens res est*)".

22. Summary of ch. 4—21 and of some subjects discussed in *De censu animae*.

1. **Cetera . . . Hermogenes**, viz. in *De censu animae*; cf. Introduction, p. 13*. — **naturalia**: cf. the note on 20, 1. — **dei . . . propinqua**: 1, 1: *istum* (sc. censum animae) *ex materiae potius suggestu quam ex dei flatu constituisse praesumpsit* (Hermogenes). — **Hic . . . videantur**: cf. *apol.* 16, 14: *haec ex abundanti, ne quid rumoris irrepercutsum quasi de conscientia praeterissemus* (a very common phrase, e. g. *Cic. fin.* 5, 27: *ne quid praetermittamus*; *Val. Max. praef.* p. 2, 13 *seqq.*; *Frontin. de aq.* 3 and *strateg.* 4, *praef.*; *Fronto, gromat.* p. 94, 3 *Lachm.* (Bendz, *Frontin.*, 16₁); *Firm. Mat. err. prof. relig.* 14, 1 and *math.* 3, 1, 15; *Philo de spec. leg.* 4, 136: ἐνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν παραλειφθῆναι τῶν ἐμφερομένων). The right interpretation of this sentence is of the highest importance for comprehending the whole treatise: "In this chapter the natural qualities of the soul discussed in my confutation of Hermogenes (viz. in *De censu animae*), where I demonstrated that the soul is more closely related to God than to matter [in 1, 1 the proof is supposed to have already been given], are only mentioned for completeness' sake", in other words: "to get a full account of the *naturalia animae*, it is absolutely necessary to consult *De censu animae* as well"; cf. the note on 6, 3 and Introduction, p. 47*. — **Dedimus** = *concessimus* (16, 6). — **libertatem arbitrii**: in *De censu animae*; cf. 21, 6 (*ut supra scripsimus*): *Inesse autem nobis τὸ αὐτεξούσιον naturaliter iam et Marcioni ostendimus et Hermogeni*. — **dominationem**: this has nothing to do with the ἡγεμονικόν, as Oehler thinks, but refers to the representation of the soul as *molitionis suae regina* (*res.* 9 = 37, 30/1; cf. *ib.*, 1. 25/6), for which cf. *spect.* 2 (2, 24/5): *universitatem . . . homini mancipatam*; *ib.* (4, 11); *res.* 5 (32, 13/4); *pat.* 4 (5, 17 *seqq.*) and 5 (6, 24 *seqq.*); *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 13); 2, 9 (347, 13). Tert. has borrowed this notion, which among Christian authors is a very common one (see Archambault's note on Justin *dial.* 41, 1; Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 33, 5), from the Stoics (*St. V. F.* 2, 1152/67); cf. Lortz, 1, 187; Bill, 51; Esser, 195; Guignebert, 550₂. — **divinationem interdum**: 6, 3: *ostendimus autem supra* (viz. in *De censu animae*) *moveri animam et ab alio, cum vaticinatur*, and 24, 10: *Multa item documenta . . . divinationem animae probaverunt, quae proposuimus iam Hermogeni*; see Introduction, p. 13*. — **interdum** has the function of an adjective; cf. the note on 1, 2: *anima tunc Socratis*. — **seposita . . . prophetia**: this addition is due to the detailed discussion of this subject in 11, 4. — **retractatu**: cf. 2, 6. — **ordinem**

eius, viz. *animae*; cf. 50, 1. — *expungam* = *absolvam* (borrowed from book-keeping; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 132; Waltz., *comm.*, 138). *ordinem expungere* also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 3, 17 (405, 19); 4, 39 (558, 5); *scorp.* 10 (169, 8/9).

2. *dei flatu natam*: ch. 4, 9, 11. — *immortalem*: in *De censu animae*, as is proved by 24, 2. — *corporalem*: ch. 5/8, *effigiatam*: 9, *substantia simplicem*: 10/1, *de suo sapientem*: 12. — *de suo*: cf. 14, 1. — *sapientem* (part., not an adj.!) is the correct reading, cf. 12, 1 and *res.* 16 (45, 23/4). — *varie procedentem*: ch. 20; *liberam arbitrii*: *De cens. an.* (cf. 21, 6); *accidentis obnoxiam*: 11, 4. The form *accidentis* instead of *-iis* is due to the clausula (1 γ, ponderous form). — *per ingenia mutabilem*: ch. 21, *rationalem*: 16, *dominatricem*, *divinatricem*: *De cens. an.*, cf. § 1 n.; *divinatrix* is Tp (also 46, 11; *schol. Hor. carm.* 3, 17, 12; *Mart. Cap.* 1, 7). — *ex una redundantem*: 20, 6; *redundantem* ∼ *fons animarum*, *ib.*, cf. 27, 9: *tota haec animarum redundantia*; *mon.* 4. — *sumatur*: “whence it is taken” = “whence it rises” (repeated in 25, 1). Cf. 31, 1: *resumuntur* = *recreantur*; *spect.* 7 (9, 4); *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (390, 1/2); 3, 9 (391, 11); *res.* 52 (109, 15). — To the enumeration of the faculties of the soul given in this chapter we may compare *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 16/8): (*anima*) *habens illas utique lineas dei, qua immortalis, qua libera et sui arbitrii, qua praescia plerumque* (cf. § 1: *divinationem interdum, qua rationalis*).

23. *Heretical views about the soul's heavenly origin, which views have all sprung from Plato's philosophy.*

“Some people are convinced that they are descended from heaven, and are sure to return there. Thus Menander's pupil *Saturninus* contended that man was created by the angels as a ‘futile worm’, but, through the compassion of the highest power, acquired a ‘spark of life’, which is one day to bring him back to his native country, viz. heaven (§ 1). A similar view is taken by *Carpocrates*, whose pupils value their own souls more highly than they do Christ and the apostles (§ 2). *Apelles* reports that a fiery angel lured the souls away from their ‘supercelestial’ abodes through the temptation of earthly food, and thereupon clothed them in sinful flesh (§ 3), whereas *Valentinus* ‘inoculates’ the ‘seed of wisdom’ into the souls (§ 4). All these theories derive from Plato, who has become the ‘pedlar of the heretics’: for in the *Phaedo* he mentions a transition of souls from one world into the other, and in the *Timaeus* a creation of man by inferior gods (§ 5). To prove all this, he has invented a theory that to learn is to remember the things we once saw in another world; hence, when I refute this theory, I shall refute the views of the heretics as well”.

With the exception of § 3, all accounts of the views of the heretics have been borrowed from Irenaeus (for details, see the comm.); the information about Plato seems to have been taken from Albinus (see the Introduction, p. 43* and the preface to ch. 28).

1. The source is Iren. 1, 18, 1 (Greek text preserved by Hippolyt. *refut.* 7, 28): καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἀγγέλων εἶναι ποίημα (Tert. *hominem . . . ab angelis factum*), ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐθεντίας φωνῆς ('I. φαεινῆς' Harvey) εἰκόνοσ ἐπιφανείσης, ἣν κατασχεῖν μὴ δυναθέντες (T.: *nec tamen plene perspectam*) διὰ τὸ παραχρῆμά φησιν ἀναδραμεῖν ἄνωθεν, ἐκέλευσαν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες · Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν · οὗ γενομένου, φησὶν, καὶ μὴ δυναμένου ἀνορθοῦσθαι τοῦ πλάσματος (T.: *opus futile et invalidum et instabile*) διὰ τὸ ἀδρανὲς τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀλλὰ ὡς σκόληκος σκαρίζοντος (T.: *vermis instar palpitasse*), οἰκτείρασα αὐτὸν ἡ ἄνω δύναμις (T.: *ex misericordia summae potestatis*) διὰ τὸ ἐν ὁμοιώματι αὐτῆς γεγονέναι (T.: *ad cuius . . . structus fuisset*; the subjunctive has causal sense, cf. διά), ἔπεμψε σπινθήρα ζωῆς (T.: *scintillulam vitae*), ὃς διήγειρε τὸν ἄνθρωπον (T.: *exsusctarit et erexerit*) καὶ ζῆν ἐποίησε (T.: *animarit*). Τοῦτον οὖν τὸν σπινθῆρα τῆς ζωῆς μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν (T.: *post decessum vitae*) ἀνατρέγειν πρὸς τὰ ὁμόφυλα λέγει. In the commentary on ch. 34 and 35, where ampler material is found, it will be shown in detail how Tert. paraphrases and embellishes the reports of Irenaeus to his liking, omitting everything he cannot use immediately, and adding numerous ironical comments. In the present passage he has omitted the steady return of the εἰκὼν to heaven, the decision of the angels, and the quotation from Genesis (the words *nec tamen plene perspectam* contain a rather obscure allusion to these particulars). The following details should be noted: a) the τρικῶλον *futile et invalidum et instabile*; b) the addition *quod consistendi vires deessent* (which after *instabile* is superfluous); c) the addition of *temere* (perhaps caused by Irenaeus' words: διὰ τὸ ἀδρανὲς τῶν ἀγγέλων); d) the contemptuous diminutive *scintillula* (Iren. σπινθήρ); e) *exsusctarit et erexerit* (Iren. only διήγειρε); f) the addition of *constantius*; g) the substitution in this 'heretical' context of the 'Christianism' *vivificare* (Iren. ζῆν ἐποίησε!) by *animare*; h) the use of *matrix*, which is frequently found in Tert.'s works (see the note on 19, 6).

Besides Hippolytus, also Theodoretus (*haer. fab.* 1, 3) and [Tert.] *Adv. omn. haeres.* 1 (214, 9/14) draw on Irenaeus; the accounts given by Epiphanius (*panar.* 23) and Filastrius (31, 2/5) seem eventually to go back to Justin's *Syntagma*; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 190/5. For the name, see *ib.* 190₃₁₃: Σατόρνιλος is the Greek, *Saturninus* the Latin form; the latter is adopted by Iren.; Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 4, 7, 3/4 and 29, 2/3 writes Σατορνῖνος (from Iren.), *ib.* 4, 22, 5 Σατορνιλιανοί (from Hegesippus). — *persuasione*: 'conviction' (this meaning occurs from Quintil. downwards). — *caelis*: for the plural, cf. Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 12. 64/5. — *indubitate*: an adverb rarely found (cf. Thes. 1. L. VII, 1: 1230, 1 *seqq.*), but fairly frequent in Tert.'s works. — *repromittunt*: see the note on 9, 4. — *induxit*, almost = *docuit*, cf. the comm. on 9, 7. — *futile* (A) is the correct reading, cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 7 (344, 3): *o dominum futilem* (M; *futilem* R vulgo); *res.* 5 (31, 11); in *pud.* (no M S S!) 2 (222, 17), Reifferscheid writes *futilia* (B.). — *scintillulam*: according to Macrobius *somn. Scip.* 1, 14, 19, Heraclitus called the soul *scintillam stellaris essentiae*. For the ψυχᾶος σπινθήρ mentioned

in the so-called 'Chaldaic oracles', cf. W. Kroll, *De orac. Chald.*, 26 and 67₂, for similar views of the Gnostics, Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 195₂.

2. The report found in this paragraph is a greatly abridged adaptation of Iren. 1, 20, 1 (Greek text from Hippolyt. *refut.* 7, 32): τὴν οὖν ὁμοίως ἐκείνη τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ψυχῇ δυναμένην καταφρονῆσαι τῶν κοσμοποιῶν ἀρχόντων (T.: *despectrice mundipotentium principatuum*), ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν δύναμιν πρὸς τὸ πράξει τὰ ὅμοια· διὸ καὶ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ τυφὸς κατεληλύθασιν (T.: *tantundem . . . vindicat*), ὥστε αὐτοὺς μὲν ὁμοίους αὐτῷ εἶναι λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἔτι δυνατωτέρους, τινὰς δὲ καὶ διαφορωτέρους τῶν ἐκείνου μαθητῶν, οἷον Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων (T.: *ut discipuli . . . praeferant*). τοὺτους δὲ κατὰ μηδὲνα ἀπολείπεσθαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς ὑπερκειμένης ἐξουσίας (T.: *de sublimi virtute*) παρούσας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὡσαύτως καταφρονεῖν τῶν κοσμοποιῶν (T. again: *despectrice mundipotentium principatuum*) διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡξιῶσθαι δυνάμεως, καὶ αὖθις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ χωρῆσαι (in the last sentence Harvey (I, 206₂) proposes to read: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὡσαύτως καταφρονούσας τῶν κοσμοποιῶν, τῆς αὐτῆς ἡξιῶσθαι δυνάμεως, which seems to be right; cf. the Latin translation: *et ideo similiter contemnentes mundi fabricatores*). Irenaeus is also the source of Epiphani. *haeres.* 27, 3, 9/10, Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 4, 7, 9/10, and Theodoret. *haer. fab.* 1, 7, whereas Filastrius (35, 1) follows another authority; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 401, and for this theory of Carpocrates, Bousset, *Hauptprobl.*, 327. The Marcosians held similar views, as is evident from Iren. 1, 13, 6: ὡς μηδενὸς δυναμένου ἐξισωθῆναι τῷ μεγέθει τῆς γνώσεως αὐτῶν, μηδ' ἂν Παῦλον, μηδ' ἂν Πέτρον εἴπης, μηδ' ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

In the account given by Tert. the following details are to be noted: a) it is necessary to write *despectrices*, unless we suppose that Tert. misunderstood Irenaeus thoroughly (which, however, is not quite impossible, cf. 49, 3). Irenaeus positively says that it is the souls of the Carpocratians which despise the κοσμοποιοὶ ἀρχοντες, and that Jesus' soul did the same. If we follow A in reading *despectrice*, these ἀρχοντες are despised by the *virtus sublimis* from which both the Carpocratians and Jesus had obtained their souls (about Jesus Iren., *loc. cit.*, remarks: καὶ . . . ὑπ' ἐκείνου (viz. τοῦ ἀγενήτου Θεοῦ) αὐτῷ καταπεμφθῆναι δύναμιν, ὅπως τοὺς κοσμοποιοὺς ἐκφυγεῖν δι' αὐτῆς δυνηθῇ. Tert. omits this sentence, but the word *perinde*, to which we can only supply *atque Christus*, contains an obscure allusion to it). Hence, if we still prefer to read *despectrice* and associate this word with the sentence τὴν . . . ὁμοίως ἐκείνη τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ψυχῇ δυναμένην καταφρονῆσαι τῶν κοσμοποιῶν ἀρχόντων, supposing that Tert. took Jesus for the *sublimis virtus* (for nobody else could have despised the ἀρχοντες), we are forced to assume that, according to Tert.'s account, Jesus obtained his soul from Himself, which is absurd; b) the words *ex sublimi virtute*, = ἐκ τῆς ὑπερκειμένης ἐξουσίας, "express a manifest gloss from the margin" (Harvey I, 206₁); the correct reading is furnished by the Latin translation of Irenaeus (*ex eadem circumlatione*) and by Epiphanius (ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς

περιφορᾶς); c) to *perinde*, as was already observed, we must supply *atque Christus*. Irenaeus continually emphasizes the parallelism: ὁμοίως (twice)... τὰ ὅμοια... ὡσαύτως... τῆς αὐτῆς... δυνάμεως... εἰς τὸ αὐτό; d) by mentioning the apostles in a subordinate clause (*nedum apostolis*), Tert. points out more clearly than Irenaeus the presumed superiority of the souls of the Carpocratians to Jesus; e) *despectrix* (also in *apol.* 26, 3) is found in Tert.'s works only; f) very remarkable is the translation of κοσμοποιός by *mundipotens* (Iren. lat.: *mundi fabricatores*); this word occurs in one other passage only, viz. *res.* 22 (56, 20: *etiamnunc luctari habens cum mundipotentibus*), where it is a subst., and is written wrongly in two words by Oehler and Kroymann. There it serves as a translation of κοσμοκράτωρ (Eph. 6, 12: "Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ... πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου"), which is usually translated by *munditenens*: *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 (642, 2. 7. 10); *fuga* 12, 3 (where Thierry's constitution of the text is wrong); *adv. Val.* 22 (200, 4/5): *diabolum quoque... Munditenentem appellant* (sc. Valentiniani; Iren. 1, 1, 10: *diabolum... quem et Cosmocratorem vocant*). Cf. von Soden, *Paulustext bei Marcion und Tert.*, 253 ("So ist *mundipotentes* (viz. instead of *munditenentes*) wohl Umschreibung Tertulians"). For the originally astrological conception of κοσμοκράτορες (a usual denomination of planets, cf. Wendland, *Kultur*, 177₂), see Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 163/4, and his note on Ephes. 6, 12 (*Hdb. N. T.* 12, p. 75); Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 2, 44 (§ 85); Cumont, *Relig. or.*⁴, 269 (note 109); Peterson, Εἰς Θεός, 173₁ and 238₃. In the passage under discussion we must perhaps suppose the influence of Tert.'s polemics against Marcion, according to whom *cosmocrator* in Eph. 6, 12 denoted the creator of the world or his servants (Iren. 1, 25, 1; *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 (641, 25 *seqq.*); Harnack, *op. cit.*, 311*).

3. *Apelles*: cf. *praescr.* 34, 8: (donec) *Apelles creatorem angelum nescio quem gloriosum superioris dei faceret deum legis et Israelis, illum igneum adfirmans*. Instead of *illum*, Harnack (*Marcion*, 406₁*) proposes to write *alium*, because he thinks it impossible that the *igneus angelus* was identical with the *creator* (see *ib.*, 189 and 191). However, his arguments are not sufficient to prove that Apelles indeed meant two different forces; at all events, the opposite view is supported by *c. Chr.* 8, 5 *seqq.*: *Sed quoniam et isti Apelleiacci carnis ignominiam praetendunt maxime, quam volunt ab igneo illo praeside mali sollicitatis animabus adstructam et idcirco indignam Christo... Angelum quendam inclitum nominant, qui mundum hunc instituerit et instituto eo paenitentiam admiserit ('admisceuerit', Harnack (*op. cit.*, 407*), which is certainly wrong). For further details, see Harnack, *op. cit.*, 404*/20*, and his thesis *De Apellis gnosi monarchica* (Leipsic 1874); Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 536/8. Irenaeus and Clemens Alex. do not know the name of Apelles; the first author to mention him is Rhodon (used by Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 5, 13). The account given by Hippolytus in his 'Syntagma against 32 heresies' was used by Epiphanius (*haer.* 44), Filast. 47, and [Tert.] *Adv. omn. haeres.* 6. The author of the last-*

mentioned work seems to have borrowed some data from Tert.'s lost treatise *Adversus Apelleiacos* (mentioned in *c. Chr.* 8, 11/2; cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 408*/9* and T U XX 3, 93 *seqq.*), like Hippolytus in *refut.* 7, 11. 38; 10, 20. The accounts based on the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus describe an earlier stage of Apelles' doctrine; they do not mention the fiery angel. The later form is described by Rhodon (Euseb. *hist. eccles.*), by Tert. in *Adv. Apelleiac.* (this work has been drawn on in his extant writings), and by Origen (the fragments collected by Harnack, *op. cit.*, 412*/8*); for Theodoretus, see Harnack, *ib.*, 371* and 419*. The detail that the fiery angel tempted the souls by means of earthly food, is mentioned nowhere else; for a parallel in the *Acta Thomae*, see Wendland, *Kultur*, 180; cf. also Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 131 and 230. — *supercaelestibus*: ὑπερουρανίοις (Plat. *Phaedr.* 247 C; for the ὑπερουράνιος τόπος in the *Corp. Herm.*, see Kroll, *Hermes Trismeg.*, 305). Tert. seems to be the first author who uses this word (not mentioned in Hoppe's list); he also uses it in *res.* 49 (101, 18. 24); 52 (108, 22); *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 (638, 12; = *Ephes.* 3, 10). — *circumfinxerit*: ἀ. λ.

4. For Valentinus, cf. 11, 3; here again Tert. follows Irenaeus. — *examen* is sometimes used to denote the pupils of a heretic, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 5 (431, 3): *Marcionis examine*; *adv. Val.* 32 (207, 18): *spiritale examen Valentini*; Prosper Aquit. *carm. de ingratibus* 48: *examine in illo* (sc. Pelagii); Pacian. *ep.* 1, 1. Tert. makes an extensive use of the word, e. g. 30, 2: *examina gentis*; 36, 1; *adv. Marc.* 1, 5 (296, 15). In Greek this metaphor is also fairly common from Soph. (frag. 794), Cratin. (frag. 2: σοφιστῶν σμῆνος), and Aristoph. (*Nubes* 297: see van Leeuwen's note) downwards. — *infuleit*: see the note on 11, 3. — *historias atque milesias aeonum suorum*: Irenaeus and Tert. often compare the systems of the heretics, especially Valentinus's, to mythological stories or tragedies: Iren. 2, 18, 1: (Valentiniani) *inenarrabilia et incognita mysteria solos se dicentes scire: quae ubique in theatris ab hypocritis splendidissimis vocibus comoedisantur, transferentes in suum argumentum, imo vero eisdem argumentis docentes, tantummodo immutantes nomina*; 2, 13, 3: *de passione enim, quam sine complexione conjugis passam eam dicunt* (sc. Valentiniani), *iterum reliquam universam velut tragoediae compositionem affinxerunt*; 2, 14, 3: *ea quae est de Ogdoade ipsorum, et de duodecade fabula*; *ib.* 1, 1, 8; Tert. *adv. Val.* 1 (177, 3/5; the first sentence of the treatise!): *Valentiniani, frequentissimum plane collegium inter haereticos* (cf. here: *examen Valentini*) . . . *ad fabulas facile est*; *ib.* 3 (180, 11/2); *ib.* 12 (191, 2/4), the system of Valentinus is compared to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Cf. also Hippolyt. *refut.* 6, 42, 2; Novat. *de trin.* 8; Epiphan. *panar.* 31, 3; Greg. Nyss. *orat. catech., praef.* (2, 15 *seqq.* Srawley): Τὰς ἡπατημένας περὶ τῶν δογμάτων μυθοποιίας (viz. of the heretics). — *historias* = *fabulas*. Cf. Pl. *Bacch.* 158: *satis historiarumst*; Hor. *carm.* 3, 7, 20; *Culex* 4 (see Leo's note); Prop. 1, 15, 24; 3, 20, 28; 4, 1, 119; Tert. *apol.* 15, 4: *argumenta et historias noxiis ministrantes*; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 46; *spect.* 10 (13, 17); Apul. *met.* 2, 12; Arnob. 5, 14; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*,

qu. 114, 9; Serv. *ad Aen.* 1, 235; Thes. I. L. VI, 3: 2840, 5/30; Dombart, A. L. L. 3, 230/4; Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 97; Gudeman's note on Tac. *dial.* 3, 7; Kroll, *Stud.*, 59₃₄; Reitzenstein, *Amor und Psyche*, 70. — *milesias*: 'novels', so called after the work of Aristides of Miletus. Cf. Rohde, *Gr. Roman*, 584/7; Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Die griech. Novelle* (Halle 1913), 77 *seqq.*; Christ-Schmidt, *Griech. Lit.*, 2, 481/2. The subst. also occurs in Apul. *met.* 4, 32 (*ib.* 1, 1: *sermone isto Milesio*); *S H A*, *Clod. Albin.* 11, 8 and 12, 12; Hier. c. *Rufin.* 1, 17 and *comm. in Isai.* 12, *pr.*; Charis. 194, 4; 196, 5; 200, 20; cf. Mart. Cap. 2, 100: *mythos poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias Milesias historiasque mortalium*.

5. *condimentarium*: as a subst. this word occurs in this passage only; for the influence of Plato on Valentinus, cf. the note on 18, 4. — in *Phaedone* . . . *inde huc*: 70 C: Παλαιὸς μὲν οὖν ἔστι τις λόγος οὗ μεμνήμεθα, ὥς εἰσιν ἐνθένδε ἀφικόμενοι ἐκεῖ (sc. αἱ ψυχαί) καὶ πάλιν γε δεῦρο ἀφικνοῦνται; cf. also 28, 1. — in *Timaeo*: 69 C (rather than 42 E/43 A): τῶν δὲ θνητῶν τὴν γένεσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ γεννήμασι (T. *genimina*) δημιουργεῖν προσέταξεν (*delegata* . . . *genitura*) • οἱ δὲ μιμούμενοι, παραλαβόντες ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον (*accepto initio animae immortalis*), τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο θνητὸν σῶμα αὐτῇ περιετόρνευσαν (*mortale circumgelaverint corpus*). For *genimina*, see the note on 21, 4. The *gen. dei* correspond to the *mundipotentes principatus* of Carpocrates and the fiery angel of Apelles, the *imm. init. animae* to the *semen Sophiae* of Valentinus, and the transition of the souls from one world to the other to the doctrine of Saturninus. — *genitura* (first used by Manil.) before Tert. only occurs in Plin. *n. h.* with the meaning 'production' (in Tert.'s work also in *res.* 61 (122, 26); *adv. Val.* 14 (193, 2) and 22 = 200, 4). Other meanings found in Tert.'s works are: 'the incarnation of Christ' (c. *Chr.* 22, 7), 'generation' (*adv. Marc.* 4, 23 (496, 19) = Luc. 9, 41; *ib.* 4, 31 (528, 13) = Deuter. 32, 20), and 'creation' (*pat.* 2 = 2, 21; cf. 38, 3); as a technical term of astrology the word occurs in 25, 9. — *circumgelaverint*: the only other instance of this word is found in Plin. *n. h.* 13, 120. — *tum* . . . *alicuius*: cf. 18, 12 and *pall.* 2, 1.

6. *retro*: 'formerly'; we see this signification originate in Hor. *carm.* 3, 29, 46 and Stat. *silv.* 1, 4, 68 (cf. Vollmer's note). In this passage the original meaning is still felt, as in Cic. *republ.* 1, 37, 58: (reges) *deinceps retro usque ad Romulum*. Tert. is the first to use *retro* as a complete equivalent of *antea*. Cf. Oehler's note on *spect.* 9; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 113; Sverr., *Pallad.*, 399/400. — *transvenire*: this verb is used by Tert. only (also *apol.* 19, 1, i. e. the *frag. Fuld.*). — *discentias*: Tp; also in 24, 11 and Hier. *adv. Rufin.* 3, 40 (where the present passage is copied): *discentias reminiscencias esse*. — *reminiscencias*, which also is Tp, occurs, except in the passages just quoted, in *ad nat.* 2, 13, 9 (conjecture by Oehler) and Arnob. 2, 19, 28. The primary source is Plato *Meno* 81 C/D, *Phaedo* 72 E, and *Phaedr.* 249 C; probably the present passage derives from Albinus (cf. Introduction, p. 43*). — *edoctas* is the correct reading, cf. 51, 1. — *quae haeretici mutantur*:

cf. § 5 and 3, 1. For the use of *mutuari* with an accus. in Tert.'s works, cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 57 (1929), 11₂. — *repercutiam* = *refellam*; many instances are given by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 103/4; cf. also *c. Chr.* 8, 9 and *apol.* 16, 14 (*inrepercussus*). — *elidam*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 37 (548, 23); Hoppe, *op. cit.*, 98; *Thes. l. L.* V, 2: 373, 29/37.

24. Confutation of the Platonic doctrine of reminiscence.

"I. First of all it is impossible that the soul should be able to forget, if it really is the divine being which Plato considers it to be (§ 1). (On the contrary we Christians know that, though being immortal, it is greatly inferior to God, and hence able to sin as well as to forget) (§ 2). If it is divine, it cannot forget anything; for forgetfulness is shameful in the same degree as its opposite, viz. reminiscence, is something splendid. Besides, if the soul may still lose its ability to remember, it is doubtful whether it will be able to regain it afterwards (§ 3). — II. If the knowledge of the 'Forms' belongs to the *naturalia animae*, it is highly improbable that the soul forgets them, for the natural knowledge of *naturalia* is never completely lost; on the other hand, man forgets many things which seem to be inherent in the nature of the soul, but in reality are no more than *accidentia* of this nature (§ 4). Even animals never forget these *naturalia*, for instance the lion (§ 5); hence man will not forget them either: he will always know that he must hear with his ears, etc. (§ 6). And if he never forgets the functions of the senses, he will do so even less in the case of the *intellectualia* (viz. the 'Forms'), which are said to be highly superior to the former (§ 7a). — III. Whence does this power of oblivion come? "From the influence of time", says Plato. But the soul is regarded by him as unborn, so that it is not subject to the influence of time (§ 7b). If, however, oblivion is really due to time, it should not begin at the moment that the soul enters this world, for it existed before the body (§ 8a). And if the soul does forget the 'Forms' at its entrance into this world, when exactly does it do so? Immediately after its descent into the body? But in this case no time has yet passed to cause oblivion! So we are forced to assume that it takes place a little later; but in that case the soul will be able to remember the 'Forms' for some time after birth. But how are we to imagine that the soul forgets them after some time, and then somewhat later regains the recollection of them? Moreover, our whole life will not suffice to obliterate the remembrance of the life preceding the soul's descent into the body! (§ 8b). — IV. "Oblivion is due to the influence of the body". But is it possible that a born substance abolishes the power of an unborn one? And are we to suppose that the bodies, which are so different from each other, in each case cause the same oblivion? (§ 9). Plato himself admits that the soul is able to prophecy; but if the body is no impediment to prophecy, it will be so even less to reminiscence. If nevertheless it is true that the body prevents the soul from remembering, it will certainly make the remembrance of the 'Forms' impossible (§ 10b). — V. If Plato were right, children

would have a clearer remembrance of the 'Forms' than adults (§ 11a). — VI. Since we all have forgotten the 'Forms' in the same way, we should also regain the remembrance of them in the same way; but Plato is the only man who has really regained this remembrance! (§ 11b).

By this discussion of Plato's theory we have at the same time confuted the heretics (§ 12)".

Hardly ever has the opinion of an adversary been combated by Tert. as thoroughly as Plato's doctrine of ἀνάμνησις. According to Karpp (who, however, adduces nothing to support his view), he follows Soranus throughout this chapter; against this we may point out that in doxographical literature this theory does not seem to have been discussed (in all other cases where he assumed the influence of Soranus, Karpp has referred to Aëtius; cf. his survey, p. 42/3). It seems more probable that, just as in the chapters dealing with metempsychosis, Tert. consulted the special literature on this subject, more especially the monograph by Albinus. To prove this we draw attention to the fact that the starting-point for this digression is to be found in the end of chapter 23, where Tert. discusses a passage from the *Phaedo* (70 C), and that the same passage is quoted at the beginning of ch. 28, where its interpretation by Albinus is adduced. Secondly, we see from § 10 that Tert.'s mind was engaged by this subject at the time when he was working upon his treatise *De censu animae*, and almost certainly was not yet acquainted with the psychology of Soranus.

Albinus' Ἐπιτομή (for this title, see the Introduction, p. 42₄*) contains no details corresponding to the contents of this chapter; since, however, many of such details are to be found in Olympiodorus' commentary on the *Phaedo*, we are justified in supposing that in the greater work of Albinus they were to be found as well (see for this conclusion the comm. on 29, 3/4).

The most important thing we learn from Olympiodorus is that Strato of Lampsacus was the greatest opponent of Plato's theory. The following arguments thought out by him are adduced: a) if this remembrance of the 'Forms' really exists, it is incomprehensible that all our knowledge should be based on proofs, and that nobody becomes an accomplished musician without practice (Olymp., p. 158, 6/8 Norvin); b) if the souls possessed knowledge before the origin of time, they cannot possibly have lost it, as they are neither dependent on time to obtain something nor undergo any influence from it; if they possess it ἀπὸ χρόνου, their knowledge is not founded on the remembrance of the 'Forms' (p. 223, 8/11); c) the remembrance should be brought about more easily (p. 223, 18; I assume that here, too, we have an argument thought out by Strato, not a question raised by Olympiodorus himself; it is not possible to make certain about this, especially because Norvin in his edition has not kept the various arguments separate). In opposition to this Olympiodorus remarks: a) on the contrary, there are numerous autodidacts; moreover, the soul at the moment of birth is strongly perturbed on account of its connection with the body (πολλῶ τῷ κάρῳ . . . τῆς γενέσεως 158, 8/12; cf. also 158, 16/7;

159, 30/1; 210, 20/4). And finally, there is a great difference between *ἀνάμνησις* and *ἀποδείξις* (211, 19/23): ἡ γοῦν ἀποδεικτικὴ ἀνάγκη πείθει τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ ἀνάμνησις. ἢ, φησὶν ὁ ἐξηγητὴς, τὰ πρῶτα δι' ἐπιβολῆς ἀπεφάνθη, προσετέθησαν δὲ αἱ ἀποδείξεις κατὰ διάρθρωσιν. ἄμεινον δέ, βοηθείας ἕνεκα φάναι τὴν ἀπόδειξιν εὐρῆσθαι. b) Strato's division is not right, as "beside things existing before the origin of time and things which have come into existence since that moment, there are also things which have always existed and will still be in existence as long as time lasts" (223, 14/7). Moreover, souls were created as perfect beings, and so also possessed knowledge (viz. of the 'Forms'); hence, if they have to learn many things after entering the body, this learning cannot possibly be more than remembering (223, 11/4; for the difficulties concerning the influence of time on memory, cf. also Plotin. 4, 3, 25); c) some people do remember things quite easily, though it is true that the greater part needs exercise (223, 18/9). Finally, from the list of arguments in favour of the Platonic theory ascribed to Plutarch (212, 1/26) we note the third: Εἰ παῖδες εὐμαθέστεροι, ὥς ἐγγίους τῆς προβιοτῆς, ἐν ᾗ ἡ μνήμη ἐσώζετο (to this Olympiodorus remarks: ἐπιπόλαιος ὁ λόγος).

In the present chapter several details reminding us of Strato's arguments occur. His remark that time cannot possibly exercise any influence on the soul, if it has come into existence *πρὸ χρόνου*, may be found again in the third argument adduced by Tert. and the assertion that remembrance is not brought about easily, may be compared to the end of § 11; moreover, the argument put forward by Plutarch finds a parallel in § 11a. On the other hand, there are considerable differences, the most important consisting in Tert.'s overlooking the fact that, according to Plato, oblivion is due to the soul's entering the body (besides the passages quoted from Olympiodorus we may adduce *Phaedo* 75 E: λαβόντες (sc. τὰς ἐπιστήμας) πρὶν γενέσθαι γιγνόμενοι ἀπώλεσamen), as it is the connection with the body which perturbs the soul. Instead of this he says in his discussion of the possibility that it is time which causes oblivion, that oblivion either takes place immediately or only after some time, and with regard to the former possibility does not mention birth, but more generally childhood; nor does he speak about birth when dealing with the influence of the body on the soul. In the same way his circumstantial argument concerning the *naturalia animae* is practically valueless, as these qualities and faculties cannot be put on a level with the knowledge of the 'Forms' which, according to Plato, was lost at the moment of birth (see the comm. on § 4). It seems quite possible that Tert., to avoid difficulties and to facilitate his confutation, deliberately suppressed this point.

Still more important is the fact that he misinterprets the essence of the Platonic *ἀνάμνησις* by making it appear that this 'renewed recollection' should lead to an immediate and complete knowledge of the 'Forms'; he does not in the least take into account the fact that by *ἀνάμνησις* Plato understands a faded remembrance of a former existence, which only gradually may develop into real knowledge.

This is particularly clear in § 11a, where it is argued that children, as they learn things quickly (a fact emphasized already by Plato himself, and afterwards by Plutarch), ought to have a better recollection of the 'Forms' than adults. The words *quorum* (sc. *studiorum*) *discentiae reminiscentiae* *fiunt* bring out Tert.'s misinterpretation with particular clearness: whereas, according to Plato, it is the ἀνάμνησις which makes learning possible, Tert. argues that learning leads to a continual exercise of memory, and so inverts the relation between the two notions.

With regard to the remaining arguments not much is to be said. The first is no more than a repetition of a passage from *De censu animae*, the second is based on notes which are probably due to Tert.'s reading of Pliny. The remark in § 9 that the unborn soul cannot possibly undergo any influence from the body may have been caused especially by Lucr. 3, 754/5 (though it is also found in other discussions of the theory of ἀνάμνησις): *illud enim falsa fertur ratione, quod aiunt / immortalem animam mutato corpore flecti* (cf. Heinze's note). For the rest Tert. does not deal with this argument at great length; probably he feared (though of course he takes Plato's point of view here) that his own theory on the corporeality of the soul might be endangered by it. Finally, two similar arguments occurring in § 9 (*non erit corporalitas multiformis in causa exitus uniformis*) and § 11 (*cur non ex aequo omnes recordamur, cum ex aequo omnes obliviscamur?*) show the spirit of Tert. so clearly that we need not seek for sources here (it goes without saying that especially the first argument is valueless, for it is the *corporalitas qua talis*, not the *corporalitas multiformis*, to which the *uniformis oblivio* is due).

Thus we arrive at the same result we already often attained when analysing the contents of other chapters: Tert. is well-informed about the various arguments concerning his subject, but continually adapts his materials to his special purposes; we certainly do him wrong in supposing with Karpp that he has confined himself to repeating Soranus' argument. It remains rather curious that the experiment made in the *Meno*, which would have been an excellent target for Tert.'s sarcasms, is not mentioned here; Arnobius and Augustine never hesitated to make good use of it.

A few words may still be said about the other confutations of Plato's theory occurring in patristic literature; without exception they are completely different from Tert.'s argument. First of all, we have to mention a passage from Irenaeus (2, 50/2), which, however, is chiefly directed against the doctrine of metempsychosis in general. In ch. 50 he argues that the transmigration of souls is impossible, since we are forced to suppose, if it exists in reality, that we have forgotten everything about it; according to Irenaeus, this complete oblivion is not sufficiently explained by the fact that the soul stays in the body, as we also remember our dreams (to this we may compare Tert.'s remark in § 10 that the *divinatio* of the soul is not destroyed by the body). After this he combats the conception of a draught from Lethe, reasoning that Plato cannot possibly have known anything

about this. Finally, he demonstrates once again that the body is not the only cause of oblivion.

The confutation occurring in Arnob. 2, 19/28 is much more circumstantial. He begins by arguing that the souls "have not come flying along as divine and learned beings", as many of them are strikingly stupid. If to learn were the same as to remember, all men should *unum nosse unumque reminisci* (19; cf. § 11 from this chapter). A man kept isolated since birth would be completely helpless when entering human society (20/3). The experiment made in Plato's *Meno* is valueless; it would have failed in the case of the man just described (24); the truth is that we gradually acquire knowledge during the course of our life (25/26a). It is said that oblivion arises *ex oppositu corporis*; but if the soul is incorporeal indeed, the body cannot exercise any influence on it (≈ Tert. § 9). [From this it follows that the souls are neither incorporeal nor immortal: 26b/27]. We remember many things from our earthly life, that is to say from a time during which the soul stays in the body. And how are we to suppose that souls may know anything about their former existence, if oblivion, which is due to the body, has such power? (28). In ch. 26 we observe the influence of Lucretius (cf. A. Röhricht, *Die Seelenlehre des Arnobius* (Hamburg 1893), 16. 51); the remaining arguments are probably to be ascribed to Arnobius himself. Lact. *div. inst.* 7, 22 confines himself to the confutation of Verg. *Aen.* 6, 713 *seqq.*, whilst Augustine only discusses the experiment mentioned in the *Meno* (*de trin.* 12, 15, 24): *gradatim quippe atque artificiose interrogatus, videbat quod videndum erat, dicebatque quod viderat*; similarly, *retract.* 1, 4, 4 (where he recants his former adherence (*soliloq.* 2, 20, 34) to the Platonic doctrine). For some other passages concerning the λήθη of the soul, cf. Kroll, *Herm. Trism.*, 341₄.

1. For §§ 1/3, see also the Introduction, p. 12*/3*. — **Primo quidem** is often used by Tert. to open a sentence; for more instances, cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 89. — **cedam** is followed by an *accus. c. infin.* as in *idol.* 17 (50, 23; before Tert. only Prop. 1, 9, 28; frequent in the writings of lawyers, cf. Thes. I. L. III: 728, 39/49). — **armare** is interpreted in Thes. I. L. II: 620, 2/3: "i. quasi armatum auxilium adducere". It seems more probable that the verb means 'to make something into a weapon'; a similar use is found in *pud.* 16 (255, 29 *seqq.*): *alicuius capituli ancipitis occasionem (-ne Gel. Reiff.) adversus exercitum sententiarum instrumenti totius armare (-ri B Gel. Reiff.)*. We may compare the use of *privat* = *priv(at)as facit* in 2, 2. A different sense occurs in *adv. Marc.* 1, 11 (305, 16/9): *nam et quale est, ut creator . . . tantis operibus notitiam sui armaverit?* ('sicher stellen' Hoppe, *Synt.*, 180). The sense is almost 'extruere' in *adv. Val.* 3 (180, 17/9): *denique hunc primum cuneum congressionis armabimus detectorem et designatorem totius conscientiae illorum*; Ambrst. in *Ephes.* 4, 15: *pravae mentis colloquia adversus veritatem armata* (if need be, the present passage may also be interpreted in this way). — **incorruptibilem**: Tp; for more instances, cf. Matzkow, 44₁₀₉. — **quia hoc et deum credidit, viz. incor-**

poralem. *Hoc* is frequently used to repeat a word from the preceding sentence, e. g. *apol.* 12, 5: *ignibus urimur: hoc et illi a prima quidem massa*; *ib.* 9, 5; 44, 3; *adv. Prax.* 26 (278, 25): *hoc* (sc. *filium dei*) *et satanas eum* (Christum) *in temptationibus novit*; cf. Waltz, *Ét.*, 362; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 63₃; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.* 2, 9 and Eran. 7 (1907), 99/100. — *ineffigiabilem*: ἄ. λ. — *principalem*: according to La Cerda, this refers to the ἡγεμονικόν (*animae principale*, ch. 15); Tert. is much more likely to mean that the soul is *dominatrix* (22, 2); cf. Albin. *Isag.* 25: καὶ μὴν ἡγεμονεύει ἡ ψυχὴ φύσει · τὸ δὲ τῇ φύσει ἡγεμονικὸν τῷ θεῷ εἰσὶν. For *innatam*, cf. 4; *immortalem*: cf. *Phaedr.* 245 C (see 6, 1); *incorruptibilem*: Aët. 4, 7, 1: Πυθαγόρας Πλάτων ἄφθαρτον εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν; *incorporalem*: ch. 6; *invisibilem*: 8, 3 (*aiunt*); *ineffigiabilem*: 9, 2; *uniformem*: 10, 1; *rationalem*: 16, 1/3; *intellectualem*: ch. 18. — *proseriberet* = *inscriberet, titularet*; cf. the note on 13, 2.

2. *adpendimus*: cf. the note on 55, 4: *patriarchae et prophetae appendices dominicae resurrectionis*. This expression recalls the προσαρτήματα which play so important a part in the psychology of Basilides' son Isidorus (Clem. Alex. *strom.* 2, 20, 112); cf. also Marc. Aurel. 12, 3. — *longe infra deum expendimus*: this singular expression is, of course, due to parallelism (∞ *adpendimus*). — *dilutioris* = *infirmioris*; cf. e. g. *res.* 7 (34, 14): *dilutior auctoritas*. Gell. 20, 1, 12. — *exilioris felicitatis*: this qualification is explained by *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (347, 15/9; cf. the Introduction, pp. 10*/1*): *hoc ipsum* (sc. *peccare*) *ergo potuit adflatus dei admittere; potuit, sed non debuit. potuisse enim habuit per substantiae exilitatem, qua adflatus, non spiritus, non debuisset autem per arbitrii potestatem, qua liber, non servus*. The meaning of *felicitatem* is shown by a sentence from the same chapter (346, 23/4): *anima, imago spiritus, solam vim eius exprimere non valuit, id est non delinquendi felicitatem*. — *nativitatis*: cf. the note on 11, 6, *exorbitationis*: Tp. — *affinem*: this adj. is found in connection with a genit. from Ter. *Haut.* 215 downwards (cf. Haase, *Vorles. z. lat. Synt.*, 2, 143 and Landgraf's note on Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 18, p. 50); from Tert. we may adduce *pat.* 7 (12, 1); *idol.* 10 (39, 23/4); *adv. Marc.* 4, 31 (526, 26) and 5, 3 (574, 15). In *res.* 32 (71, 10): *discendi magis adfinis quam praesumendi*, the adj. is almost equivalent to *cupidus*. — *eum Hermogene*: viz. in *De censu animae* (Introduction, pp. 12*/3*). For this passage many parallels may be quoted from patristic literature, e. g. Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 2, 2, 4; 2, 3, 5 (the soul is not a *portio dei*); *de gen. ad litt.* 7, 1, 3; 7, 21, 30; *de gen. c. Manich.* 2, 8, 11 (cf. Rüsche, *Seelenpneuma*, 62_g); Prudent. *apoth.* 786/7: *crede animam non esse deum, sed crede creatis / maiorem cunctis, ipsam quoque crede creatam*. It is for this reason that in *cathem.* 3, 100 the original text *ore animam dedit* (sc. *deus*) *e proprio* was changed afterwards by a scribe into *flavit et indidit ore animam* (cf. J. Bergmann, *Eran.* 12 (1912), 119 and my discussion of these passages in *Mnemos.* III ser. 11 (1942), 75/7). Finally, we may quote *synod. Brag.* (a. 563), *cap.* 5: *si quis animas humanas vel angelos ex dei credit substantia extitisse, sicut Manichaeus et Priscillianus dixerunt, anathema sit*.

We are also reminded here of the well-known view of Justin, Tatianus, and Athenagoras (for which cf. Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 127/8. 163. 199) that the soul does not naturally possess ἀφάρσῖα (in which case it would be τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νοῦ μέρος, as Justin says), but has received this quality by a special act of God's will; since, however, this theory is based on the interpretation of Gen. 2, 7, it is hardly probable that the Greek apologists have influenced Tert. here.

3. **peraequatione**: Tp (also *pud.* 8 (235, 12) and *adv. Val.* 12=191, 15), probably a law term (cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 82; the word is not discussed by Beck). — **ita nee**: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 3, 16: *sint ergo et animalia* (sc. dei), *quia mobilia per se; etiam mobilia per se, quia non per alium, tamen, ut eo non statim dei, quia animalia, i t a n e c ideo, quia per se mobilia*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 7 (298, 22). — **memoria scilicet**: it is certainly wrong to follow Bmg and Kroymann in writing *memoriae*, as the word which is emphasized by the addition of *scilicet* by this very addition becomes isolated from the context. A parallel is furnished by *res.* 35 (76, 18/9): *et relinquitur corpus intellegi id, quod in promptu sit, caro scilicet*; cf. also Hier. *vir. illustr.* 53: (Pontius narravit) *Cyprianum . . . sibi crebro dicere 'Da magistrum', Tertullianum videlicet significans*. For the very common habit of putting an apposition in the nominative, see Löfst., *Per.*, 50/1; Horn, 67/73 and 101/2; Konjetzny, 307/8; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 175/6 and *Compos. Luc.*, 135; Ebert, 363; Sjögren, *Eran.* 19 (1919/20), 149/50; Heidrich, 27; A. Erikson, 22; Biese, 77 *seqq.*; Blomgren, *Fort.* 1, 87₁; Kroll's note on *Cic. orat.* 163; for the same usage in Greek, see Moulton, *Class. Rev.* 18 (1904), 151; Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 106/7; Blass-Debrunner, § 136, 1; Windisch's note on *Jac.* 3, 8 (*Hdb. N.T.* 15, p. 24). In general cf. Havers, *Handbuch*, 1/2 (for literature, *ib.*, 214) and Glotta 16 (1928), 105 *seqq.* — **Plato**: *Phileb.* 34 A: σωτηρίαν τοίνυν αἰσθήσεως τὴν μνήμην λέγων ὁρθῶς ἂν τις λέγοι κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν δόξαν. It should be noted that Tert. writes *sensuum et intellectuum* (cf. 19,7 n.): from ch. 18 he is familiar with this combination, which may have been mentioned here in view of the discussion following. The same addition is found in Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 13 (p. 202 Matth.): ὥς δὲ Πλάτων, σωτηρία αἰσθήσεως τε καὶ νοήσεως (cf. also Sext. *Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 373 = *St. V. F.* 1, 64). — **Cicero**: *de orat.* 1, 18: *quid dicam de thesauro rerum omnium memoria?* (*ad Herenn.* 3, 16, 28; *acad. pr.* 2, 22). This qualification of memory is also rather common in Christian writings, e. g. Aug. *confess.* 10, 8, 14 (for Augustine's discussions of memory, see Balmus, 261 and especially M. Grabmann, *Grundgedanken des hl. Aug. über Seele und Gott* (Cologne 1929), 34/5); Verecund. *Iunc. in cant. Manasse* 22; Cassiodor. *de anim.* 12 and *Varia* 5, 22; cf. also Antipater, frag. 15 (*St. V. F.* 3). — **in dubium deducetur**: this rather rare expression occurs for the first time in Tert.'s works (also in 43, 6 and *adv. Marc.* 3, 20 (410, 9) = *adv. Iud.* 11, 73); *in d. vocare* is found in *adv. Marc.* 2, 5 (339, 25) and *res.* 36 (78, 23), *in d. devocare* in 17, 13. — **nescio an**: 'probably not', see the note on 1, 2. — **utrumque**: viz. oblivion and the renewed recollection

afterwards (cf. 10, 7 *utrumque = vivere et spirare*). At the end of this argument Tert. returns to the discussion given in § 2.

4. *Secundo gradu*: cf. 6, 5 (*gr. sec.* in a different context: *adv. Marc.* 4, 16 (471, 13) and 4, 29 = 521, 1/2). — *compotem*: 'acquainted with', not 'participating in', as is shown by the words *naturalem scientiam*, cf. the note on 55, 2. Tert. begins by stating that the knowledge of the 'Forms' is natural to the soul. After this he does not dare without more to contend that a natural knowledge (and hence the knowledge of the 'Forms' as well) is never lost, and so mentions the knowledge of natural things instead. This sophism is disguised by the insertion of a sentence which combines both assertions: *nemo ergo concedet naturalem scientiam naturalium excidere*. Next the notion 'natural things' is narrowed down by identifying it with the *sensualia*, which in their turn are opposed to the *intellectualia* (it is evident that by these *intellectualia* Tert., though he does not say so explicitly, means the *ideas*; cf. ch. 18). The argument may be summed up in the following way: "A. *scientia idearum naturalis est*. B. *naturalis scientia naturalium* (= *sensualium*: § 6) *non excidit*. C. *ergo naturalis scientia intellectualium* (= *idearum*), *quae sensualibus potiora sunt* (§ 7), *non excidit*". As was already observed in the preface to this chapter, the *naturalia* mentioned here, especially the functions of the senses which man never forgets during his life on earth, are not on a level with the 'Forms', the knowledge of which may have been lost at birth or in consequence of a draught from Lethe, so that this argument has not the slightest conclusive force. No less curious is the assertion in § 5 that the lion may lose his savageness, and his habits in general, but will never lose his natural qualities. This contention is due to the fact that Tert. wishes to assume as many *accidentia* as possible, because he is going to pretend that the only *naturalia* are the functions of the senses. Moreover, the choice of these *naturalia* ascribed to the lion (*pabula, remedia, terrores*) was dictated to him by the instances which he found in his sources. — *excidere*; *artium excidet* is the right punctuation (Gomperz; *excidere artium*; *excidet A B Gel*). It is true that in this way the anaphora of *excidet* disappears, but on the other hand it is hardly possible to separate the *artes* from the *studia*. Moreover, Tert. in §§ 5/6 continually mentions the *scientia naturalium*, so that it is obvious that here, too, we must regard *naturalium* as a subst. It is also probable that *studiorum* should be connected with another subst., firstly because a similar combination (*doctrinarum, disciplinarum*) is found in the next part of the sentence, secondly because *studium* frequently occurs in enumerations (17, 11; 20, 4; 31, 3; cf. 31, 4). — *doctrinarum, disciplinarum*: the same combination occurs in 20, 3 (on the whole this paragraph is hardly more than a repetition of 20, 3/5). — *ingeniorum et affectuum*: similarly, 5, 4: *de speculo . . . morum et ingeniorum et affectuum*; 31, 3; 32, 8. It goes without saying that by *ingenia* Tert. understands faculties which are already being evolved, and during this evolution are dependent on external influences, not natural abilities as such. We may

compare 20, 1 where, referring to Seneca, he argues that the faculties (*ingenia*) proceed from the natural abilities (*insita semina omnium artium*). It is only these original abilities which are regarded by him as *naturalia* and *substantiva animae* (20, 1), for, though he says that they develop 'along with the soul', he admits that chance plays an important part in their evolution (20, 2); hence he in this passage argues that the *ingenia*, the faculties which have already reached maturity, *naturae videntur, non tamen sunt*. — *non tamen*: for this rather abrupt transition, cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 66. — *ut praemisimus*, viz. in ch. 20. — *pro locis*: 20, 2: *Nam et hic etiam de locis interest*. — *pro institutionibus* ('schooling', cf. 46, 11): 20, 3: *de doctrina disciplinae*. — *pro corpulentis ac valetudinibus*: 20, 4: *Fortassean et de corpore et valetudine aliquid accedat*. — *pro potestatibus dominatricibus*: 20, 4: *super haec, si et aliquae praesunt potestates*. — *pro libertatibus arbitrii*: 20, 5. The plurals are due to parallelism (the first plural, *locis*, is necessary). — *ex accidentibus*: cf. the resumé in 20, 6.

5. *mansuetudinis eruditione*: this was the task of the *mansuetarii* (*S H A Heliog.* 21, 1). *Sen. ep.* 85, 41: *certi sunt domitores ferarum, qui saevissima animalia et ad occursum expavescenda hominem pati subigunt nec asperitatem excussisse contenti usque in contubernium mitigant*. *eruditio* occurs here and in *paen.* 6, 3 for the first time in connection with an object. genit. (cf. *Thes.* 1. L. V, 2: 833, 68/73). For the use of *erudire* in Tert., cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 26. — *suggestu*: cf. 1, 1. — *delicium*: 'pet animal' ([Verg.] *Copa* 26; *Martial.* 1, 7, 1; 13, 98, 1; in *Phaedrus* 4, 1, 8 the sense is ironical). — *Berenices*: *Aelian. hist. anim.* 5, 39: καὶ Βερενίκη λέων πρῶτος συνῆν, τῶν κομμώντων διαφέρων οὐδέν. ἐφαίδρυνε γοῦν τῇ γλώττῃ ἡσυχῇ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς. This note may have been borrowed from a book belonging to 'pseudo-Democritean' literature (see the Introduction, p. 47*). — *alicuius*: cf. 15, 2. — *emaculans*: this very rare verb, which is used for the first time by *Plin. n. h.* 21, 129, also occurs in *c. Chr.* 4, 32; *res.* 8 (37, 1); *adv. Marc.* 4, 9 (443, 1). — *Mores . . . permanebit*: for the motive of the curious assertion that the savageness of the lion is to be classed among the *acidentia naturae*, see the comm. on § 4. The normal view was, of course, that the savageness is a natural quality, which, though mitigated by training, is never completely lost; cf. e. g. *Pind Olymp.* 11, 19/21; *Sen. ep.* 85, 8; *Stat. Achill.* 1, 858/63; *Boeth. consol. philos.* 3, 2, *carm.*, 13. — *de piscibus . . . de placentis*: this use of *de* instead of a partitive genit. without a governing noun is occasionally found from *Plaut. Stich.* 400 downwards; cf. *Thes.* 1. L. V, 1: 57, 66 *seqq.* and for Tert., *Hoppe, Synt.*, 38; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 58₂ (we may add *c. Chr.* 14, 24/5: *filius . . . mittitur ad vinitores . . . de fructibus petiitum*). In *Cypr.* only one instance is found, viz. *laps.* 25 (255, 18): *de sacramento calicis infudit* (in *dom. or.* 18 (280, 18) the expression is due to *Joh.* 6, 51; cf. *Merkx*, 31). See for more instances *Löfst.*, *Per.*, 106/9 and especially *Synt.*, 1, 118/9; *Wack.*, *Synt.*, 2, 217; *Salon.*, *Vit. Patr.*, 89 *seqq.*; *Bonnet*, 611; *Ahlquist*, 78; *Vroom*, 75; *Ch. Müller*,

2; Svern., *Oros.*, 32. — **simiam leo requirer**: it is impossible to decide whether this and the next note (*gallum . . . formidabit*) have been borrowed by Tert. from Plin. *n. h.* or from another work belonging to 'pseudo-Democritean' literature; as the lion of Berenice is not mentioned by Pliny, the alternative may seem more probable, but, on the other hand, the words *et si nullum illi venabulum obfirmabit* are almost certainly due to Tert.'s reading of this author. For this note, cf. the passages collected by Wellmann, *Abh. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1928, 7, p. 38/40; Plin. *n. h.* 8, 52: *Aegritudinem fastidii tantum sentit, in qua medetur ei contumelia, in rabiem agente adnexarum lascivia simiarum. gustatus deinde sanguis in remedio est.* In Christian literature this habit of the lion is mentioned by Tatian *orat.* 18 and Ambros. *hex.* 6, 4, 26 (both have copied Neptunalius). — **venabulum obfirmabit**: this remark seems to be due to Plin. *n. h.* 8, 51: *cum pro catulis feta dimicat* (sc. leaena), *oculorum aciem traditur defigere in terram, ne venabula expavescat.* Kellner translates: "wenn sie ihm gegenüber auch keinen Jagdspieß befestigt", Oehler interpretes: 'firmum faciet', and Reifferscheid proposes to read *obfirmabitur*, whereas Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 102 supposes that the verb has pregnant sense here and translates: "wenn sie ihm auch keinen festen Jagdspieß entgegenhält"; for this pregnant use he refers to *adv. Marc.* 4, 6 (433, 4): *differentiam scindit* = *scindendo efficit*, and 4, 19 (482, 1): *omnia de occulto in apertum repromittit*, but points out that the present passage is more peculiar still. Linguistically Hoppe's interpretation is certainly possible, but as to the sense it is not satisfactory, for how are we to understand a sentence like this: "if she does not point a solid hunting-spear at him, he will nevertheless be afraid of a cock"? Rather should we expect: "and if she points a hunting-spear at him, he will not fear it, but nevertheless he is afraid of a cock". Hoppe's error lies in his regarding *regina* as the subject of *obfirmabit*, for, in spite of the threefold repetition of *et si*, an exact parallelism of three sentences is not found here; this is already shown by the circumstance that in the first two sentences the predicate of the subordinate clause takes the past future tense, but in the last the future tense, and, moreover, rhymes to *formidabit*: thus this sentence becomes isolated from the rest. The only possible explanation seems to be that we should regard *venabulum* as the subject of *obfirmabit*, and assume that this verb has intransitive sense: "and if (whereas) no hunting-spear will stop him (cf. the passage just quoted from Plin. *n. h.*), yet he will on the other hand be afraid of a cock". To this use of *obfirmare* we may compare the similar use of *obstruo* by Cic., *Brut.* 17, 66: *Catonis luminibus obstruxit haec posteriorum quasi exaggerata altius oratio*, and *pro domo* 44, 115: *primo se luminibus eius esse obstructurum minabatur*; perhaps also *Aratea* 344: *sin autem officiens signis mons obstruet altus* (the last-mentioned instance is adduced by Löfst., *Krit.*, 38, in his discussion of *apol.* 1, 1: *si . . . infestatio sectae huius os obstruit defensioni*, where *os* is missing in some manuscripts belonging to the *traditio vulgata* and was also omitted by Oehler; it seems, however, preferable to follow Löfstedt in retaining *os*). As an

equivalent of *obstruere* the verb *obfirmare* occurs in Apul. *met.* 7, 28 (176, 4/5 Helm): *pertica qua stabuli fores offirmari solebant*; with intrans. sense: Ter. *Eun.* 2, 1, 11, followed by an infin.: Plaut. *Persa* 222 and Iul. Valer. 1, 35: *ab ingressu oppidi arcere Alexandrum offirmaverunt*. We must not lose sight of the fact that in this passage the choice of the verb is primarily due to rhyme (cf. the note on 2, 2). — **gallum . . . formidabit**: other instances collected by Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 40 and *Physiolog.*, 72 (we must add Sext. *Empir. Pyrrh. hypot.* 1, 58); Plin. *n. h.* 8, 52: *atque hoc tale, tam saevum animal . . . gallinaceorum cristae terrent* and 10, 47.

6. **inobliitterata**: this adj. is not a *ἀ. λ.* (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 143): it also occurs in Pacian. p. 119, 16 Peyrot (cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* III ser., 7 (1939), 187); it is fairly probable that Pacianus borrowed it from Tert. — **naturalium**: which here are identified with the functions of the senses, as is both shown by the rest of the sentence and by the summary: *hi sunt certe sensus*, etc. For the structure of the argument, see the comm. on § 4. The words *omnium forsitan obliviosissimo* may be due to the well-known stories about the marvellous memory of elephants, etc., as are told by such authors as Aelianus; moreover, they may be the outcome of the circumstance that Tert. is continually narrowing down the contents of *naturalia* (see the note on § 4). In § 5, where he discussed animals, he had not yet thought of identifying the *naturalia* with the functions of the senses, as is shown by the instances which he adduces (e. g. the lion's fear of the cock); it is only in § 6, where he returns to the discussion of man, that this thought presents itself to him. The result of this is that man has a less retentive memory than the animals have. — **ut . . . scilicet**: a combination frequently occurring in Tert., cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 114/5. — **esurie** (also *adv. Prax.* 16 = 257, 14; 258, 15) is Tp. — **videndum**, etc. after *bibendi* is to be regarded as an instance of the varying of cases; cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 12₃ (the alternative left open by him, viz. that *videndum* is a gerundive, is highly improbable). — **depretiat**: cf. 17, 3. — **philosophia**, viz. the doctrine of the philosopher *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (cf. the note on 4: *philosophi opinio*). — **intellectualium praelatione**: as has been expounded in ch. 18 (*praelatio* occurs in 18, 10).

7. **sensualium . . . intellectualium**: as was observed already in the comm. on § 4, this sentence contains a sophism, for to *permanet* we should add mentally *in hac vita*, to *intercidet*: *in nativitate*. This sophism has the better chance of passing unobserved, as from ch. 18 the reader is familiar with the antithesis *sensualia . . . intellectualia*, which has got a different sense here on account of the identification of the *intellectualia* with the 'Forms' of Plato. — **potior** has been used continually in the same context in ch. 18 (§§ 10/12). *Videtur* is found in some places where Tert. refers to a view not shared by himself (see the note on 47, 3). For the ensuing discussion of the possibility that oblivion is due to the influence of time, cf. the preface to this chapter (pp. 305/6). — **Satis improspecte**: the only other instance of

this adverb is found in Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 23: (Iephtha) *improspecte voverat*; *prospecte* (Tp) occurs in *apol.* 6, 7. Parentheses of this kind are not rare in Tert., e. g. *exh. cast.* 12, 39: *satis consulte et inprimis fideliter*; *adv. Marc.* 4,25 (503, 26): *satis inique*; *ib.* 5, 20 (649, 2); *res.* 2 (27, 4, with Oehler's punctuation); for instances from other authors, see Kroll's note on Cic. *Brut.* 67. — *neque . . . admittendo*: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 3, 6: *quod ut deus neque initium neque finem sui patitur*. — *nullum . . . patitur*: cf. e. g. Boëth. *consol. philos.* 5, 6, 6: *quod . . . temporis patitur condicionem*; we are also reminded of Aristotle's discussions of the influence of time, e. g. *phys.* 4, 12 (221b 1 *seqq.*): φθορᾶς γὰρ αἴτιος καὶ αὐτὸν μᾶλλον ὁ χρόνος ἄριθμὸς γὰρ κινήσεως, ἡ δὲ κινήσις ἐξίστησι τὸ ὑπάρχον. — *quae innata dicatur*, sc. a Platone (cf. the comm. on 4).

8. In this paragraph too the various arguments have been kept completely separate: after having argued in § 7 that time cannot possibly exercise any influence on the unborn soul, Tert. now surmises the existence of such an influence in spite of all. This method of discussion again points to the *Apologeticum* rather than to Soranus. — *in causa est*: cf. 17, 6. — *sine dubio prior corpore*, viz. according to Plato; it is evident that to Tert. this thought is unacceptable (cf. the comm. on ch. 27). — *et quae* is the correct reading: just as in 7, 2, *et* followed by an interrogative pronoun serves as introduction to a question which, after the exposition of the adversary's view, contains Tert.'s own opinion. — *quale est, ut* occurs very frequently in Tert.'s works (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 68 and 82); cf. also Hofm., *Synt.*, 763; Lfst., *Arnob.*, 72; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 137; Lavar., 283. — *illam . . . inruerit*: *inruo* is found as a transitive verb from Frontin. downwards (cf. C. F. W. Müller, *Nom. u. Akk.*, 137); in 31, 4 it is equivalent to *devorare* (see the note). — *vitae decursio*: the normal expression would be *vitae decursus* (cf. 56, 7); *decursio* very rarely occurs in this context: *Novell. Justin. app.* 8: *-o barbarici temporis*; Eustath. *Basil. hexam.* 1, 5 (872 C); Gregor. *Magn. moral.* 33, 12: *humani generis -o* (here 28, 1: *-us generis humani*). — *evertendam* is the correct reading; cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 107₃.

9. *demutat*: Reifferscheid's conjecture *demotat* is unnecessary, for it is often seen that *mutare* was considered to be cognate to *movere* (according to F. Muller, *Altital. Wörterbuch* (Göttingen 1926), 271, *mutare* finds its origin in a confusion of *moitaio* (from a root *mei-* = 'to exchange') and *mōŋ(i)to* > *muto* = 'to move (oneself)'; a different explanation is given by Ernout-Meillet², 648). To illustrate this affinity, Muller refers to Plaut. *Amphitr.* 273/4: *nam neque se Septentriones quoquam in caelo commovent, neque se Luna quoquam mutat*; Hor. *carm.* 3, 6, 41/2: *sol ubi montium mutaret umbras*; Verg. *Aen.* 12, 37: *quae mentem insaniam mutat?*; Cic. *orat.* 18, 59: *ergo ille princeps* (sc. orator) *variabit et mutabit* (sc. vocem) (the three last-mentioned instances are not particularly convincing); Ovid *trist.* 5, 2,73: *hinc ego dum muter, vel me Zancloae Charybdis devoret*; Krebs-Schmalz,

Antibarb., 2⁶, 117, and Compennass, Glotta 8 (1906), 109/10 (who only adduces one text from a very late period, viz. *Acta S. Cassiani episc. Tudertini* 8: *non valebant se de loco mutare, in quo stabant*). We may add Tac. *hist.* 1, 76, 1: *metu ac necessitate huc illuc mutabantur* (*nutabant* Ruperti); Cic. *pro Rabir. Postum.* 9, 25; perhaps Prop. 2, 9, 33: *non sic incerto mutantur flamine Syrtes* (here, however, a different interpretation is also possible), and *Ciris* 218: *mutantia* (H¹ R, Helm; *nutantia* H² A L, Ellis and Lenchantin de Gubernatis; *micantia* Schwabe, Hielkema; *nictantia* Scaliger, Vollmer) *sidera mundi*. In texts from a later period this sense is fairly frequently found, e. g. in Aug. *confess.* 3, 4, 7: *ille vero liber* (viz. Cicero's Hortensius) *mutavit affectum meum et ad te ipsum, domine, mutavit preces meas*; Amm. Marc. 29, 5, 52: *eosque . . . mutaret in metum*; *ib.* 29, 3, 6 (for this passage, cf. Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 132₁); Rufin.-Gregor. Nazianz. *orat.* 8, 3, 5: *huc atque illuc semper vertitur et mutatur*; *ib.* 7, 19, 1. It often means 'to transpose', 'to shift' and so forms an intermediate between 'to move' and 'to change', e. g. [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 23: *auctoritatem enim viri immutant in feminam*; Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 14 (Anecd. Mareds. III, 2: 27, 26 seq.): *huc illucque mutatur* (sc. tabernaculum), *et cum transmigrante migrat* (likewise, *ib.* 83 = p. 87, 9); Muscio 1, 69 (25, 20/1 Rose): *panno etiam loca ipsa contegant ita ut frequentius illuc mutetur*; Vita S. Caesar. Arelat. p. 477, 10 Krusch: *dum in vase alio cum summa velocitate mutaretur* (sc. oleum). For *demutare* we may refer to It. Gal. 1, 6 (Cypr. *ep.* 27, 3 and 63, 10): *tam cito demutamini ab eo . . . ad aliud evangelium* (μετατίθεσθε, Vulg. *transferimini*); Hilar. c. Constant. 11: *ipsum usque ad mortem demutasti exiliis*. In Italian *transmutare* is used in the same way, e. g. Dante *Inf.* 29, 69: *si trasmutava per lo tristo calle*; *Purg.* 3, 132 (cf. Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 1, 15, 138: *aegros . . . ex tenebris ad lucem transferre* ∞ *ib.* § 142 *aegros ad alium transmutare locum* and § 132). That Tert., too, considered *mutare* and *movere* as cognate verbs, is shown by 25, 3: *ponderis regio mutetur*, and by the pun made in *pall.* 3, 1: (*cauda pavi*) *totiens . . . mutanda quotiens movenda*. Finally, it may be pointed out that *demutare* very frequently occurs in Tert.'s works (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 71; Thes. l. L. V, 1: 519, 84 seqq.), whereas *demotare* would be a ἄ. λ. For the argument, cf. 18, 1/2. — **gentilitate**: 'nationality' (also 30, 2 and *v. v.* 2; before Tert. this sense is only found in Plin. *n. h.*, Min. Fel.).

10. **teste ipso Platone**: this may refer to *Phaedr.* 242 C: ὡς δὴ τοι, ὦ ἐταῖρε, μαντικόν γέ τι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ or *Tim.* 71 D seqq. (probably to the latter passage, as in § 11 *Tim.* 24 B is used). — **Hermogeni**: viz. in *De censu animae* (see Introduction, p. 13*). It is to this same passage that Tert. refers in 6, 3: *ostendimus autem supra moveri animam et ab alio, cum vaticinatur*. — **ominis**: if this reading (Bmg; *hominis* A B) is indeed the correct one, it may be due to a reminiscence of *test. anim.* 5 (140, 25/6): *recogita (animam) in praesagiis vatem, in o m i n i b u s a u g u r e m, in eventibus prospicem*, in which passage omen is on a level with *eventus*. — **augurem**: for the use as an adjunct.,

see the note on 19, 8. — **obstrepi** = *adversatur* (from Plin. 11, 148 and Flor. 2, 19, 5 downwards). Here again, just as in § 7, we find the *argumentum a fortiori*.

11. **reminiscerentur**, sc. *idearum* (which, of course, throughout this chapter should be added mentally to every word denoting reminiscence or oblivion; cf. also the end of this paragraph . . . *cur non ex aequo omnes recordamur . . . Plato . . . solus . . . i d e a r u m et oblitus et recordatus est*): Tert. has no intention of denying the obvious fact that children have a much better memory than adults (it seems probable that here again his argument is due to a passage from the *Timaeus*, viz. 26 B: ὥς δὴ τοι, τὸ λεγόμενον, τὰ παίδων μαθήματα θυμαστόν ἔχει τι μνημεῖον), but makes use of it to refute Plato. The argument runs as follows: “A. Children have nothing to do but to learn (*ipsis solis debitaē studiis*); B. According to Plato, this learning is a permanent exercise of memory (*quorum* (sc. *studiorum*) *discentiae reminiscendae fiunt*). C. Hence the memory of children is continually in action <, and with this active memory they ought to remember the ‘Forms’ much better than adults; as this is not the case, Plato’s theory stands confuted>”. In the preface to this chapter (pp. 305/6) we have already pointed out that this argument is founded on a misinterpretation of Plato’s theory. The circumstance that children learn things quickly was generally regarded as an argument in favour of the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις: the experiment carried out in the *Meno* is based upon it (cf. 85 C/E; in *Phaedo* 72 E, which is also often adduced in this context, children are not mentioned); for Plutarch, cf. preface, p. 305; cf. also Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 24, 57; *Cato mai.* 21, 78 (the passages from Cic. have been copied by Lact. *div. instit.* 7, 22, 19). — **recentiores**: the reading of A is justly defended by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 32/3) against Hartel’s conjecture *recentioris*; *anima* is almost equivalent to ζῶον here. — **debitae**, not *deditae* (Gel.) is the correct reading; cf. Thörn., *loc. cit.*, and 1, 10; Thes. I. L. V, 1: 104, 24 *seqq.* and 59 *seqq.*; Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 65/6 (*paen.* 6, 1; 6, 19). For *pat.* 14 (21, 18), see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 53, for Novatianus, Koch, *Novat.*, 281. We may add *carm. de Sodom.* 53: *virginitas in flore tumens, iam debita messi* and perhaps Prud. *perist.* 2, 91/2: *ut debita* (M; *dedita* Bergmann) *stipendiis / ducem iuvet pecunia*. For *discentiae* and *reminiscendae*, see the note on 23, 6, for *gentium silva*, on 2, 6: *silva materiae*. — **sapientium prato**: *pratum* is also used metaphorically in *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (459, 16), together with *silva*, to denote a quantity: *tamquam in silva vel in prato vel in nemore pomorum*. Moreover, we may find here an allusion to *Phaedr.* 248 B: οὐ δ’ ἐνεχ’ ἡ πολλὴ σπουδὴ τὸ ἀληθές ἐστιν πεδίον οὐ ἐστίν, ἥ τε δὴ προσήκουσα ψυχῆς τῷ ἀρίστῳ νομὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἐκεῖ λειμῶνος τυγχάνει οὐσα (*Resp.* 10, 616 B; Orph. frag. 154 Abel; Plut. *de facie in orbe lunae* 28, 6; for the part played by the meadow in eschatology, see R. E. Glanville Downey, *Class. Philol.* 26 (1931), 94/7; we may also refer to the λειμῶνες Σελήνης mentioned by Plut. *Amator.* 20 (766 B), on which the souls are said to sleep till the moment of their re-birth). Probably the

metaphorical use of *pratum* in this passage was also facilitated by the fact that the words *Prata* and *Λειμῶνες*, like *Silvae*, were used to denote writings with varied contents (see e. g. Schanz, *Röm. Lit.*, 3^a, 63; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 6, 1, 2, 1 says that his book *λειμῶνος δίκην πεποίκιλται*).

12. At the end of the chapter Tert. points out that the confutation of Plato's theory is only due to the wish to combat the heretics. — Instead of *et si* we should expect *si et* (cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 84). — *consistit* "holds good", "is valid", *apol.* 25, 1: *quemadmodum probatio consistat*; a juridical term, cf. Thes. l. L. IV: 468, 83 *seqq.* — *et innatae.... et recordatae* is repeated from 23, 6; Tert. returns to his starting-point. — *ad occasiones . . . haereticis subministrandas*: εἰς τὸ παρασχεῖν ἀφορμὰς τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς. For the use of this word in the NT and by the Apostolic Fathers (e. g. 1 Tim. 5, 14: μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν), see Bauer's note on Ignat. *ad Trall.* 8, 2 (*Hdb. N. T.*, *Erg. Bd.*, p. 237). The apologists very often use ἀφορμή (-αί) and *occasio* (-nes) in this context, e. g. Clem. Alex. *strom.* 3, 3, 19, 4: καὶ συνελόντι εἰπεῖν <τοῦ> κακὴν λογίζεσθαι τὴν ὕλην ἀφορμὴν οὐ παρέσχεν (sc. Plato) τῷ Μαρτίωνι; Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, *epilog.*; 6, 7, 1; 6, 20, 4; 6, 41, 5; 7, 37, 1; 8, 19, 3; 10, 26; 10, 27, 3; Iren. 1, 24, 1; 1, 26, 2; 3, 14, 4, etc.; [Justin] *Quaest. ad orthod.* 4; Method. *de resurr.* 1, 58, 1; Tert. *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 2/3): *et dant haereticis occasionem spiritum dei delicto offuscandi* (see also the note on 38, 3); Novatian. *de trin.* 19: *occasionem haereticis contulisset*; Hier. *in Gal.* 6, 11; *in Ion.* 2, 7; *in Tit.* 1, 15, etc.; Rufin. *apol.* 1, 18; Ambrst. *in 1 Tim.* 3, 6; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, *append.* 57, 2. The orthography *occasions* (A; cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 459; Bonnet, 118. 153; Baehrens, *App. Probi.* 95; Stangl, *Bob.*, 26; Tidn., *Did.*, 118) is altogether out of the question here. For *subministrandas*, cf. *praescr.* 39, 18: *ut haereticis materias subministrarent*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 25 (504, 14/5): *ingenia haereticis sumministrantes* (clausula 1 α!).

25. *Refutation of the view that the embryo is not yet in possession of a soul.*

"After this digression I return to my starting-point (the end of chapter 22), viz. the origin of the soul. To the discussion of this subject it is immaterial whether I shall have to attack philosophers, heretics, or common opinion (§ 1). The Stoics and Aenesidemus, and occasionally Plato too, contend that the soul enters the body at the moment of birth, more exactly at the first breath (§ 2). However, mothers and women with child or in childbed know better: they are convinced that the embryo has its own life (§ 3). Everything the embryo does and undergoes, is impossible without life; moreover, the circumstance that often children are still-born, suffices to prove that the rest are living beings (§ 4). Not seldom the child is killed by the physicians before its birth to save the life of the mother; thus physicians, too, are convinced that the embryo is a ζῷον (§ 5). — The view that the soul springs from the cold air surrounding us, a view which is usually

supported by a reference to the affinity of the Greek words $\psiυχή$ and $\psiύχος$, does not mean much; or are we to suppose that the Romans obtain their souls in a different way, because their language does not denote them by the word $\psiυχή$? Moreover, many people are born in hot regions, where there is no cold air at all, and at all events the lying-in room is always hot! (§ 6). All the nations living in the eastern and southern part of the earth are far more clever than the Sarmates, whose minds are just as rigid as their climate is (§ 7). — We may also think of Bacchus and Scipio, who as living beings were excised from the womb. And if some clever reasoner should follow Plato in supposing that no two souls any more than two bodies are to be found in the same place, we shall refute him by advancing various instances of the still more curious union of non-human souls with a human one: the *daemonium* of Socrates, the seven spirits dwelling in Magdalen, and the legion of spirits which stayed in the man from Gerasa (§ 8). Plato himself remarks that one should guard against causing damage to the body and soul of the future child by some *vilitas concubitus*, but in saying so he supposes that the soul also springs from the sperm, and contradicts his former opinion. Other arguments for this origin of the soul are furnished by the resemblance of children to their parents, and by the circumstance that astrologers regard the moment of conception as the beginning of life (§ 9)".

The principal motive for the assertion that the embryo has a soul is once more to be found in the desire to defend the doctrine of the Church: the belief in the transmigration of souls, which is in flat contradiction with the dogma of resurrection, rests on the conviction that the soul enters the body at birth, and so may easily be confuted by demonstrating that the soul is extant in the embryo from the moment of conception. We are not to lose sight of these facts, especially, because Karpp (p. 45/6) makes it appear that it was Soranus who induced Tert. to assert that the embryo is an animate being. It is true that Soranus considered the embryo as a ζῷον (though probably not from the moment of conception: see the discussion of this difficult question in the note on 37,2); only we should guard against the supposition that Tert. should ever have adopted a view upheld by Soranus, if on other grounds he had not already convinced himself of its being right (or useful).

The discussion of this subject fills two chapters, the second of which (ch. 26) is entirely based on scriptural texts; so particulars borrowed from Soranus can only be found in the present chapter, and Karpp does not hesitate to regard the whole chapter as copied from this author (p. 35: "Ihm gehört die Gelehrsamkeit des ganzen Kapitels, wie sich an einzelnen Zügen ausdrücklich zeigen lässt"); however, it will be necessary to examine the various arguments more closely.

It goes without saying that the doxographical survey (§ 2), at least as far as it deals with the Stoics, must have been taken from Soranus (for the note concerning Aenesidemus, see 9, 5, for the view ascribed to Plato, the comm. on § 2). The passage about gynaecological

instruments (§ 5) may come from the same source; in his *Γυναικεῖα* Soranus had devoted a special chapter to this subject (*Περὶ ἐμβρυολογίας καὶ ἐμβρυοτομίας*, 4, 9 (61)/13 (65) = p. 140/4 Ilberg; still it is rather curious that two instruments mentioned by Tert. are not described there). If Soranus has discussed such instruments in the *Περὶ ψυχῆς* (this, however, is not quite certain: Tert. may also refer facts that were generally known or even have consulted a physician), he must have done so with regard to the question of the embryo's having a soul, for otherwise this discussion would have been useless there; hence it is probable, or at least possible, that he, too, considered the necessity of killing the embryo in special cases as an argument in favour of the view that the foetus is an animate being; but then he may also have referred in this context to the children that are still-born, so that the latter part of § 4 should be traced back to him as well (however, there remains an equally plausible possibility that the entire passage is Tert.'s intellectual property). On the other hand, the first part of this paragraph must certainly be ascribed to Tert. himself, as is shown by the definition of the state of health as *accessio animae* (see the comm.). With regard to the apostrophe occurring in § 3 it is not easy to make a definite statement. According to Karpp (35₆), it must have been borrowed from Soranus, as in the *Γυναικεῖα* this author also discusses the movement of the embryo, the *κίσσα*, and the mutual influence of mother and child on each other. Against this we may point out, firstly, that it is a matter of course that these subjects are discussed in the *Γυναικεῖα*, secondly, that Soranus, though he mentioned the fact of the embryo's being a ζῷον shortly before (1, 43, 3 = 30, 22/3 Ilb.), does not connect it at all with the data just mentioned, thirdly, that similar arguments also occur elsewhere (e. g. Porphyry *ad Gaur.* 5, 1 (quoted by Karpp): ἀλλὰ κινεῖσθαι φασὶ (sc. οἱ τὸ ἐμβρυον ζῷον λέγοντες) τὰ ἐμβρυα μεταβατικῶς κατὰ τόπον θερμῆς τε διαπύρου αἰσθησὶν λαμβάνειν σκιρτῶντα ὅταν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἐν τοῖς βαλανείοις ὁ διάπυρος ἀήρ <περι>πέσῃ, οἱ δ' ἔτι γενναϊότερον ἰστάμενοι καὶ τὰς ἀτόπους ἐπιθυμίας, αἷς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ κύειν αἱ μητέρες ἐνίσχονται), and finally, that an appeal to the *indocula sapientia* (cf. 6, 7) of women is in perfect accordance with the argument of the treatise *De testimonio animae*. In the second part (§§ 6/7), in which the derivation of ψυχὴ from ψῦχος is combated, the reference to the Romans as well as the argument '*cum substantia enim et vis*' is to be ascribed to Tert. himself. In §§ 8/9 the note on Scipio has been taken from Pliny, and the exposition of a curious view ascribed to Plato is hardly more than a conclusion drawn from 6, 8 (see the comm.). The quotation from Plato *Leg.* VI may have been borrowed from Soranus (who in the *Γυναικεῖα* gives a similar instruction), but, on the other hand, this passage is so frequently adduced by various authors that Tert. may have known it long before. The reference to the hereditary transmission of psychic qualities has been taken from 5, 4. As to the datum borrowed from astrology, it is hardly possible to make a definite statement; it may, however, have been generally known.

From all this it follows that, though numerous details in this chapter may have been taken from the work of Soranus, we are justified in asserting that the adaptation of the material should be ascribed to Tert. himself.

1. At the end of the digression filling ch. 23 and 24 Tert. repeats the end of 22, 2: *sequitur . . . sumatur*. For Tert.'s habit of drawing attention to the structure of his works, see Lortz, *Tert.*, 2, 153, and 155; similar instances are found in 50,1; *adv. Marc.* 1, 17 (312, 18/9): *regrediar necesse est ad originem quaestionis*; *praescr.* 31, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 13, 5. In the sense of 'digression' *excessus* is found from Plin. *n. h.*, *praef.* 12 downwards. — *sumantur*: cf. the note on 22, 2. — *specie*: originally this is a law term denoting the special case (ὑπόθεσις, *casus*) about which the judge has to pronounce a sentence (cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 78); Tert. makes an extremely frequent use of it (e. g. § 3; 34, 1; 46, 12; 48, 3).

2. *Nulla interest*, etc.: Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 17) proposes to read *in nulla* (sc. *specie*). It seems to be right that we should understand *specie*; on the other hand, the insertion of *in* is hardly necessary. Tert. may have omitted *de* on the ground that this preposition is used immediately afterwards. As an instance of the connection of the dative with *interest*, Hoppe, *Synt.*, 29 quotes *apol.* 33, 3: *interest homini deo cedere*; we may also refer to *mon.* 9: *nihil deo interest, an . . .*; for *de*, see the note on 1, 2. — *professoribus veritatis*: the genitive after *professor* occurs from Cels. 1, *praef.* downwards: *sapientiae professoribus* (Sen. *nat. quaest.* 1, *prol.* 15 still writes *sapientiam . . . professos*); Plin. *n. h.* 7, 180; *veritatis professor = philosophus*: Amm. Marc. 30, 5, 9, cf. *ib.* 22, 4, 1: *veritatis indagandae-or* (Macrob. *somn. Scip.* 1, 2, 4: *veri-oribus*; Orig. *c. Cels.* 3, 12: φιλοσοφία ἀλήθειαν ἐπαγγελλομένη; *de princ.* 4, 1, 1; [Justin] *Cohort. ad gent.* 1, etc.). Here these words are chosen deliberately to designate the Christians as the adversaries of the philosophers; on the other hand, in *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 3) *sapientiae professores* means 'the philosophers'; cf. also *cult. fem.* 2, 3, 2; *res.* 39 (82, 1); *adv. Marc.* 4, 12 (455, 2). — *figulatione*: this subst. only occurs in Tert.'s works (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 136); it is also found in *res.* 5 (31, 23). — *compingi*: in 27, 3 the verb is used in the same context; cf. my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 108. — *effuso . . . partu*: this expression only becomes frequent in the last period (Pacian. *ep.* 2, 3; 3, 6; Cypr. Gall. *Exod.* 39; Siricius *ep.* 9, 3 (1177 B); Prud. *Hamart.* 194; Macrob. *Saturn.* 1, 17, 52). — *muliebribus locis*: the usual expression is *loci* (from Cato *agr.* 157 downwards), cf. 26, 2: *in locis matris* and *adv. Val.* 7 (184, 18): *in genitalibus vulvae locis*. — *vegetatum*: this verb (from Gell. and Apul. downwards) also occurs in *scorp.* 1 (144, 11). — *compinguescere*: ἀλ.; for the conception underlying this word (the semen as *coagulum materni sanguinis*), see the preface to ch. 27. — *de uteri fornace fumantem*: cf. Basil. I, 489 C: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ θερμότητος τῷ ἀέρι περιψυχόμενα (sc. τὰ βρέφη), and the note on 26, 3: *etiamnunc calens*

matre. — *ferrum ignitum*: a metaphor frequently used in this context, for which see the note below on *hoc Stoici*. — *ibidem*: ‘immediately’, cf. 19, 7. — *vim animalem rapere*: “draws the soul towards itself”; similarly, § 3: *rapiens sibi iniurias matris* (for more passages from Tert., see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 118/9); Ovid *met.* 4, 745: (*virga*) *vim rapuit monstri*. — *vocalem sonum reddere*: Tac. *ann.* 2, 61, 1: *Memnonis saxea effigies, ubi radiis solis icta est, vocalem sonum reddens*. — *Hoc Stoici*: *St. V. F.* 2, 806 (Plut. *de Stoic. repugn.* 41 = 1052 F): Τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ φύσει τρέφεσθαι νομίζει (viz. Chrysippus) καθάπερ φυτόν· ὅταν δὲ τεχθῇ, ψυχόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ στομούμενον (the technical term for the tempering of iron; Tert.: *ferrum ignitum*) τὸ πνεῦμα μεταβάλλειν καὶ γίνεσθαι ζῶον· ὁθεν οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου τὴν ψυχὴν ὠνομάσθαι παρὰ τὴν ψῦξιν. Against this Plutarch observes: Αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀραιότερον πνεῦμα τῆς φύσεως καὶ λεπτομερέστερον ἡγεῖται, μαχόμενος αὐτῷ; *ib.* 1053 D: Γίνεσθαι μὲν γάρ φησι τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅταν τὸ βρέφος ἀποτεχθῇ, καθάπερ στομώσει τῇ περιψύξει τοῦ πνεύματος μεταβαλόντος; *de primo frigido* 2: Οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς σώμασι τῶν βρεφῶν τῇ περιψύξει στομοῦσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλον ἐκ φύσεως γίνεσθαι ψυχὴν. For the objection that the ψυχὴ, which is a thinner and finer substance than the φύσις, the ‘vegetative soul’, cannot possibly have arisen from the latter by a process of refrigeration and condensation, see also (in *St. V. F.*, *loc. cit.*) Plut. *de commun. not.* 46 (1084 E); Porphyr. *ap. Euseb. praep. evang.* 15, 813 C; Plotin. 4, 7, 11. Von Arnim has overlooked Philo *de somn.* 1, 31: γεννώμενον δ’ εὐθύς ἢ ἔξωθεν εἰσκρίνεται (viz. the νοῦς which has just been described as τὸ τέταρτον τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς) ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος ἀέρος ἢ ἐνθερμος ἐν ἡμῖν φύσις οἷα σίδηρος ἐν χαλκῶς πεπυρωμένος ὕδατι ψυχρῷ πρὸς τὸ κραταιότατον στομοῦται· διότι καὶ παρὰ τὴν ψῦξιν ὠνομάσθαι ψυχὴ δοκεῖ. . For the comparison with the tempering of iron (which occurs in almost all the passages just quoted, and so must have been employed by Chrysippus himself), cf. also Plut. *de def. orac.* 41 (433 A): περιψύξει τινὶ καὶ πυκνώσει τοῦ πνεύματος οἷον βαφῇ σίδηρον τὸ προγνωστικὸν μῦθον ἐντείνεσθαι καὶ στομοῦσθαι τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἀδύνατόν ἐστι; in a different context it occurs in *Quom. adul. ab amic. internosc.* 36 (73 C); Hippolyt. *refut.* 7, 29, 20; see also Jaeger, *Nemesios*, 52. An attempt to neutralize the contradiction condemned by Plutarch, etc. was made by Hierocles, Ἡθικὴ στοιχείωσις col. 1, 16 (cf. Emmel, 20): παχύτερόν πῶς ἐστι πνεῦμα ἢ φύσις καὶ μακρὰν ἀφεστηκυῖα ψυχῆς, κατόπιν δὲ τούτων ἀπειδὴν σχεδὸν ἡκὴ τῆς ἀποτέξεως, ἀπολεπτύνεται ῥιπιζομένη τοῖς συνέχεσιν ε καὶ . . . τὸ τυχόν ἐστι ψυχῇ, διὸ δὴ καὶ θύραζε χωρήσασα ἱκανοῦται τῷ περιέχοντι, ὥστε οἷον στομωθείσα πρὸς αὐτοῦ μεταβαλεῖν εἰς ψυχὴν. — *eum Aenesidemo*: “as well as Aenesidemus”; Tert. does not mean a special connection between Aenesidemus and the Stoics. It is possible that the mention of this philosopher here is due to a conclusion drawn by Tert. himself from 9, 5: *non, ut aer sit ipsa substantia eius* (sc. animae), *etsi hoc Aenesidemo visum est et Anaximeni* (however, if this supposition is right, it is rather strange that Anaximenes is not also mentioned here); cf. Goedeckemeyer, *Gesch. d. griech. Skept.*,

234. — *et ipse interdum Plato*: as Plato never made a definite and unmistakable statement about this subject, he was quoted as an adherent of the two conflicting views (cf. Emmel, 15/7): a) Aët. 5, 15, 1: Πλάτων ζῶον τὸ ἐμβρυον· καὶ γὰρ κινεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ καὶ τρέφεσθαι καὶ αὔξασθαι; [Galen] Εἰ ζῶον τὸ κατὰ γαστρός (cf. Wagner's edition, p. XIX), probably influenced by *Tim.* 91 A/D; b) Albin. 'Επιτ. 25 (178, 26 *seqq.* H.): τῷ δὲ ἀθανάτους εἶναι τὰς ψυχὰς λόγῳ ἡκολούθησε τὸ εἰσκρίνεσθαι αὐτὰς τοῖς σώμασι, παρ' ἐμφομέναις ταῖς τῶν ἐμβρύων διαπλαστικαῖς φύσεσι; *ib.* 17 (172, 20/1): τῆς κατὰ πεμφθείσης ψυχῆς τὸ κύριον ἐνέδησαν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν; for Porphyrius and Jamblichus, see Emmel, 16/7 (they adhere to the statements found in *Phaedr.* 246 C and *Phaedo* 81 E: ἀν... πάλιν ἐνδεθῶσιν εἰς σῶμα). The latter view (which of course is in accordance with the doctrine of the migration of souls) is much more frequently mentioned than the former. That the soul enters the body at the first breath has been recorded nowhere as a statement of Plato; perhaps Tert. was induced by *Phaedo* 70 A *seqq.* (see the preface to ch. 53) to regard the view mentioned there as the opinion of Plato himself, and hence to render εἰσκρίνεσθαι τοῖς σώμασι by *prima aspiratione*... *adduci*; however, it is also possible that he ascribed a Stoic view to Plato. For *interdum*, see the note on *ex sententia finxerit*. — *extraneam*: for the genit. after this adjunct. (also 49, 3), see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 22; cf. also *ad nat.* 1, 7, 14 and *apol.* 7, 3. The word belongs to the juridical domain (Beck, 50). — *alias*: 'at all', 'as it is'; cf. *Thes.* 1. L. I, 1549, 26 *seqq.* (frequent in the works of Tert. and in juridical literature). — *extorrem*: a genit. after this adjunct is found from *Stat. Theb.* 9, 578 and 12, 262 downwards; from Tert.'s works cf. 56, 8 and *apol.* 21, 5. See also Wölfflin, A. L. L. 13, 408; Rochus, 70; Dubois, 211. — *Videbimus* also occurs in *res.* 48 (100, 6). — *ex sententia finxerit*: this conjecture by Rigaltius seems to restore the original reading (A has *ex sententias finxerit*, not *fixerit*, as was given by Reifferscheid). Hartel, who adds *sua*, gives an interpretation of this passage which is substantially correct (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 63): "nicht das ist zu untersuchen, ob er diesen Gedanken, den er selbst nicht für richtig hielt, einem Unterredner in den Mund legte (*an sententias* oder *sententiam finxerit*), sondern, ob diese *fictio* (δόξα) mit seiner eigenen Ansicht von dem Wesen der Seele im Einklang steht, und Tertullian sucht zu beweisen, dass das nicht der Fall ist. Daher heisst es zu Ende dieses Capitels: *at idem... non de prima aspiratione nascentis*". Hartel has rightly observed that of the two opposite views Tert. regards (or is inclined to regard, cf. § 9 *nescio... exciderit*) the latter as Plato's personal conviction (we should note that by the addition of *interdum* the former is characterized as less important). On the other hand, it is not clear why Hartel rules out the possibility that, according to Tert., Plato lets one of the characters of his dialogues utter this view, which personally he does not consider correct; firstly, we know from 17, 12 (*in Phaedro ex Socratis persona negat se cognoscere posse semetipsum*) that Tert. was well aware of the fact that not every statement made in the dialogues represents Plato's own opinion,

secondly, we should note the use of *finxerit* ('*an personas in dialogis ex sententia sua* (i. e. Platonis) *loquentes finxerit*'; cf. Porphyrio's note on Hor. sat. 1, 1, 101: *haec fingit sibi dicentem eum*); thus the right interpretation of this passage might be: "we shall see if this view, which he made others utter, was in accordance with his <real> opinion". — **Hicesius**: an adherent of the school of Erasistratus, who lived in the first half of the first century b. Chr. (see Gossen, R. E. VIII: 1593/4), and was an authority on pharmacology (this, too, shows that Tert. must have learned his name from Soranus, for pharmacology was extremely important to the μεθοδικοί). — **praevaricator**, which originally means 'a fraudulent plaintiff,' in the first century after Christ gets the sense of 'forger' or 'impostor' (also *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (320, 16); 1, 27 (328, 7); 4, 43 (566, 22); cf. Beck, 169; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 236/7; Bonnet, 742; Rönsch, *It.*², 320).

3. For this passage, see the preface to this chapter, p. 319. To *respondete, matres*, etc. we may compare *c. Chr.* 20, 40/1: *respondeant obstetrices, medici et physici de uberum natura*. — **ruboratio**: ὁ λ. *inruboratus* occurs in *Did. apost.* 5, 16 Hauler: ο . . . *vultu* (Prov. 7, 13: ἀναιδεῖ . . . προσώπῳ); cf. Tidn., *Did.*, 71. — **revinci**: 'to be confuted' (from Lucr. 4, 488 and Cic. *pro Archia* 6, 11 downwards; very frequent in Jct.); cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 105/6. For *specie*, see the note on § 1, for *idoneus*, on 9, 4. — **arbiter** = *testis*, an archaism (cf. e. g. Fesser, 50.) — **quam sexus ipsius**: the numerous conjectures are superfluous, for we should understand *testis*, etc. before these words (Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 63/4). For parallels, see Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 58/61, e. g. § 5: *Itaque est inter arma medicorum et* ("also <an instrument>") *cum organo*, and 10, 9 *Plane erunt et alia genera lucis, ut* ("as <the kind proceeding>") *ex ignium ministerio*. — **convenitur** = *appellatur*, cf. 15, 4. — **vivacitatem**: before Tert. this word only occurs in the sense of 'tenacious vitality' (e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 8, 100; Val. Max. 8, 13, *ext.* 4). — The reading *de vestro* is certainly correct: 'alien to your being' (cf. also Hartel, *op. cit.*, 64). *De quo* is equivalent to *unde* (Hartel); many parallels may be adduced from Varro (collected by Dahlmann in his note on *l. l.* 8, 14, p. 71), e. g. *l. l.* 5, 16: *nam et Asia, quae non Europa, in quo etiam Syria*; 6, 55: *declinata multa in quo et fatuus et fatuae*; for *S H A Hadrian.* 11, 5: *rem inserere ex quo (ex qua Peter) constet*, see Thörnell, *Strena Upsal.*, 159, and for some similar cases, Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 148₂. — The use of **ambitio** instead of *ambitus* is again due to rhyme (∞ *regio*; see the note on 10, 6). From Tert. we may still adduce *iei.* 17 (297, 19): *ambitio corporis*; *idol.* 1 (30, 8): *elogii ambitionem*; *pall.* 4, 10: *latoris purpurae ambitio* (here, of course, we have an *ambiguum*; cf. the note on 28, 1, *divinior*); *v. v.* 8: *ambitionem capillorum* (∞ *ib.* 7: *ambitu crinium*); *apol.* 7, 11 (*ad nat.* 1, 7, 5): *quantacumque illa (viz. Fama) ambitione diffusa est*; for more instances, see Thes. l. L. I: 1851, 71/1852, 2 (the earliest is Min. Fel. 4, 6: *lateris ambitione*; they are fairly frequent in the works of Hier., who may have copied Tert.; a parallel to this passage is furnished by *ep.* 65, 19, 5: *uteri . . . ambitio*). — **mutetur**: for the second time (cf. the note on 24, 9) we see that Tert.

regarded this verb as cognate to *movere*. — *inquires*: as it seems, there are only two other instances of this subst., viz., in Plin. *n. h.* 14, 142 and Gell. 19, 9, 5. For the movements of the embryo, cf. Soran. *Gyn.* 1, 44, 3: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τήν τε κίσσαν ἐπιφαίνεσθαι καὶ πρὸς λόγον τῆς τοῦ χρόνου προκοπῆς διογκοῦσθαι τὸ ἐπιγαστρίον, εἴτα καὶ κινήσεως τοῦ κατὰ γαστρὸς ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τὴν κυοφοροῦσαν. — *ciborum vanitates*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 18 (360, 5/6): *pretiosorum ciborum ambitio*; Novat. *de cib. Iud.* 5: *sollemnitates ciborum*. To this we may compare the chapter Περὶ κίσσης, Soran. *Gyn.* 1, 48/53 (35, 1/39, 5 IIb.), especially § 3 (35, 12 sqq.): παρέπεται δὲ ταῖς ἐν τῷ <συμ>πτώματι τυγχανούσαις ἀνατροπῇ στομάχου, ἥτοι πλάδος, ναυτία τε καὶ ἀνορεξία, ποτὲ μὲν πρὸς πάντα, ποτὲ δὲ πρὸς τινα, καὶ τῶν ἀσυνήθων ὀρεξίς οἷον γῆς, ἀνθράκων, ἐλίκων ἀμπέλου καὶ ὀπώρας ἀάρου τε καὶ ὀξώδους (Muscio 1, 37 (15, 10/3 Rose) and *ib.* p. 132, 29/32); cf. also [Hippocr.] *de superfoet.* 18: ἥν τις κυῖσκομένη γῆν ἐπιθυμέῃ ἐσθίειν ἢ ἀνθράκας καὶ ἐσθίῃ, ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ παιδίου φαίνεται, ὁκόταν τεχθῇ, σημεῖον ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων (cf. the next sentence in Tert.). — *fastidiatis*: the ἀνορεξία mentioned by Soranus in the passage just quoted. — *usque et* is the correct reading, for which see the note on 31, 1. — *per . . . signatur*: cf., besides [Hippocr.] *de superfoet.*, *loc. cit.*, Soran. *gynaec.* 1, 39, 1 (27, 28/34 IIb.): τί δεῖ λέγειν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ποιὸν τῆς ψυχῆς κατάστημα φέρει τινὰς περὶ τοὺς τύπους τῶν συλλαμβανομένων μεταβολάς; οὕτως ἐν τῷ συνουσιάζειν πιθήκους ἰδοῦσαί τινες πιθηκομόρφους ἐκύησαν · ὁ δὲ τῶν Κυπρίων τύραννος κακόμορφος ὢν εἰς ἀγάλματα περικαλλῇ κατὰ τοὺς πλησιασμούς τὴν γυναῖκα βλέπειν ἀναγκάζων [ὁ] πατήρ εὐμόρφων ἐγένετο παίδων · οἱ δ' ἱπποτρόφοι κατὰ τὰς ὀχείας ἔμπροσθεν τῶν θηλειῶν εὐγενεῖς ἰσθᾶσιν ἵππους. Aug. *de trin.* 11, 2, 5 in this context refers to Gen. 30, 39.

4. In the first part of this paragraph Tert. demonstrates that whatever the embryo does or undergoes is only possible, if it has a soul. The materials for this argument are taken from § 3: *livor ac rubor* ∼ § 3 *contusionibus*; *valetudo omnis* ∼ *valetudines*; *alimonia*, *inedia* ∼ *ciborum vanitates illi desideretis*, . . . *fastidiatis*; *pavor* ∼ *excutitur*; *motus* ∼ *hi motus*. Only the words *crementa*, *decrementa* have no correspondence in § 3. — *Si livor ac rubor . . . sanguis*: the embryo may have a livid or ruddy colour in the same spots where the mother's body was bruised; the meaning of the sentence is rightly interpreted by Lindner: "si color sanguinis passio est, non sine anima sanguis esse potest, quia sine anima pati non potest". Once again we have an abridged syllogism, one of the premisses, viz. *nilhil vero pati potest sine anima*, being omitted. — *si valetudo omnis accessio est, sine anima non erit valetudo*. For the interpretation of this obscure sentence we must start from § 3: *an et valetudinibus invicem communicetis*. Lindner, the only commentator who tried to give an explanation, says: "si omnis valetudo i. e. quaecumque infantis prospera conditio accessio, i. e. incrementum, auctio foetus est, sine anima valetudo esse non potest, quia sine anima i. e. vitali vi augeri et crescere foetus non posset". He overlooks that *valetudo*, as is shown

by § 3, must mean 'state of health', not especially '*prospera conditio*', and that the growth of the embryo is only mentioned in the next sentence. To understand the words as they stand we must adduce 20, 4: *Fortassean et de corpore et valetudine aliquid accedat*; *ib.*: *Quanto magis de accidentibus habebuntur, quae citra corpulentiam et valentiam vel acuum vel obtundunt*; 24, 4: (*ingenia et affectus*) *quae naturae videntur* (= *naturalia esse videntur*), *non tamen sunt, quia . . . pro corpulentis ac valetudinibus . . . ex accidentibus constant*. Everything influenced by the condition of the body and the state of health is an *accidens* (similarly, Claud. Mam. *de stat. anim.* 1, 3 (28, 13 Engelbr.): *adfectio accessio est*), and does not belong to the *natura animae* (cf. 20, 6); it is "a thing added to the soul", an *accidens animae*. Now, if "the entire state of health" (including all existing diseases) is an *accidens animae*, everything connected with the state of health presupposes the existence of a soul; for wherever there is an *accidens animae*, there must be an *anima* as well. Hence the bruises received by the embryo may be considered as evidence for its possessing a soul. For Tert. *accessio* is often almost equivalent to *accidens*. The original verbal meaning is found in *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (320, 17/8): (*deus*) *natura bonus et non accessione*, "by any addition <taking place afterwards>", in other words, the goodness belongs to God's *substantia* and is no *accidens*. A more concrete sense is found in *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 6: *nam etsi accusandus decor non est . . . ut divinae plasticae accessio* ("something added to God's moulding of man"); *anim.* 18, 5: *accessioni deputandum quod aut deus postea aut diabolus adspiraret* ("is to be regarded as belonging to the *accidentia*"); completely synonymous to *accidens*: *iei.* 7 (282, 15/6): *semper inedia maeroris sequela est, sicut laetitia accessio saginae*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 15 (467, 14): *comminatio . . . dehortationis accessio est. Omnis*, for which Ursinus proposes to read *animae*, raises no difficulty: "everything connected with the state of health is an *accidens*"; there is no need to add *animae*, for all *accidentia* mentioned in this treatise are tacitly supposed to be *accidentia animae*; cf. e. g. 11, 5: *Nam et malus spiritus accidens res est*. — *alimonia*, which is used once by Varro, does not become more frequent until the second century A. D. — *crementum* is used in Christian literature especially, where it supersedes *incrementum*. *Decrementum*, a very rare word (since Gell. 3, 10, 11), seems to have become a 'Christianism' as well. — The argument that fear, etc. refers to the soul, so that "where there is fear etc., there is also a soul", supports our interpretation of the preceding sentence: "where there is a *valetudo*, there is also a soul". Here Tert. takes a further step: instead of saying: *si alimonia tractatio est animae, sine anima non erit alimonia*, he introduces another conception, viz. life; in doing so, he forms a transition to the next sentences. — *Qui autem . . . vivi?*: though it is not altogether out of the question that this passage was borrowed from Soranus (see preface, p. 319), the argument is in keeping with Tert.'s usual methods; to this sentence we may compare the beginning of ch. 29 and *c. Chr.* 6, 38/9: *non enim mori solet nisi quod nascitur*. — *denegat partum*: "makes birth impossible", cf. 53, 3:

cum vires equorum defatigatio denegavit. The Thes. l. L. furnishes no parallels for this use of (de)negare; however, we may refer to Muscio 2, 52: *causa . . . quae sterilitatem faciat et conceptum denegat*; 2, 91: *potest . . . conceptus fieri, partus tamen in totum denegatur*; 2, 59: *si vero lapis in collo vesicae positus urinam denegat*. For *negare*, cf. Oribas. latin. 4, 347: *purgatio negari videtur*; *ib.*: *menstruali officio omnino negato* (Cael. Aurel. morb. chron. 5, 4, 64: *impossibilitas autem, quam <isch>uriam vocant, perfecta eius officii negatio*); for Pallad. 4, 9, 9: *hinc nasci fructus, qui possint et inter frigora non negari*, see Svenn., Pallad., 647. From Tert. we may adduce *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (291, 13): *amnes glacie negantur* ('become innavigable'). — **matricida**: cf. Arnob. 3, 23: *et matrum intereunt cur cotidie millia parricidalibus nixibus interemptae?* For the use of *ni* (which is not frequent in Tert.), see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 129. — **matricida, ni moriturus**: of course Tert. starts from the supposition that it is also impossible to save the life of the child (only in this case embryotomy was permitted); in this context we may refer to Soran. *gyn.* 4, 9, 1 (140, 5/6 Ilb.): *καὶ γὰρ εἰ τὸ κυηθὲν διαφθείρει, τὴν κυοφοροῦσαν τηρεῖν ἀναγκαῖον* (cf. also 1, 60, 3/4). Probably Tert. was copied by Aug. in *enchir.* 23, 86: *Nam negare vixisse puerperia, quae propterea membratim exsecantur et eiiciuntur ex uteris praegnantium, ne matres quoque, si mortua ibi relinquantur, occidant, impudentia nimia videtur.* See the discussion of this question by Dölger, *ACH* 4 (1934), 44/8, who also refers to Theodor. Priscian. *euporist.* 3, 6, 23.

5. *est inter arma medicorum et cum organo*: see the note on § 3: *sexus ipsius*. A description of the instrument mentioned here is to be found in Muscio 2, 94 (the title of the chapter is: *Qua disciplina organo aperiendae sunt mulieres*; the corresponding passage from Soran. *gyn.* has not been preserved): *accepto organo et uncto priapisco, quam Graeci loton dicunt in aliquantum ad prunas calefacere <debes>, deinde sine quassatione priapiscum inicere, susum scilicet axe posito, iubere etiam ministro ut aperiendo organo axem torquere incipiat* (Tert.: *tortili temperamento*), *ut paulatim partes ipsae aperiantur. cum vero post visum organum tollere volueris, ministro iubere ut iterum axem torqueat quo organum claudi possit* (cf. also 2, 67 (96, 15/6 Rose); 2, 82 (108, 11); 2, 90 (113, 19); 2, 91 = 115, 7). In the beginning of the chapter Muscio also mentions the Greek name *dioptra*; hence Ilberg, p. 152, 24 supposes that the title of the chapter in Soran. *gyn.* was *περὶ διοπτρισμοῦ*. P. C. T. van der Hoeven, *Operatieve verloskunde*, 151, incidentally mentions this passage and observes that it is not certain whether this instrument was used to open the *ostium* or the vagina; the passage just quoted makes the latter possibility more probable. Perhaps a specimen of the *διοπτρα* has been preserved in the famous collection of gynaecological instruments from Pompei (for a photograph, see e. g. Döderlein, *Handbuch der Geburtshilfe, Ergänzungsband*, p. 253). — *secreta* is often equivalent to *genitalia muliebria* or *vulva*, e. g. Amm. Marc. 28, 1, 28: *velamen . . . secreto membrorum sufficiens*; Faust. Rei. *serm.* 2 (231, 13 Engelbr.); *de spir. s.*

2, 2; Hegesipp. 3, 12, 2; 5, 40, 1; *ep. de cast.* 4, 7 (p. 129 Caspari). — **torili temperamento**: as is shown by the parallelism (∞ *arbitrio* and *puerperio*), *temperamentum* must denote an action: 'by a rotatory motion' (Labriolle, *Arch. gén. de méd.* 83 (1906), 1324 translates: "grace à une courbure habilement ménagée"); cf. Muscio, *loc. cit.*: *ut aperiendo organo axem torquere incipiat*. — **anulocultro** (ἀ. λ.): Gelenius' conjecture *anulo cultrato* is certainly wrong, for *cultro* is the fundamental notion. Linguistically the form *anulocultro* is quite possible, cf. Skutsch, *Kl. Schr.*, 176; Klotz's note on *bell. Afr.* 25, 1. Probably Tert. means the instrument described by Celsus 7, 29: *Remedio est cervix praecisa, ut separatim utroque pars auferatur. Id unco fit, qui priori similis* (see the next note) *in interiorem tantum partem per totam aciem torquere exacuitur*; for more details, cf. the note on *aeneum spiculum*. Perhaps this *uncus* was similar to the ἀγκυλότομος (for a photograph of which see Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Chirurgische Instrumente des Altertums*, Jenaer mediz.-histor. Beitr., 1 (Jena 1912), IV, 12). — **cum hebet unco**: the ἐμβρουλός (Soran. 4, 9/10 (unfortunately he gives no description of this instrument); Paul. Aegin. 6, 74) or ἐλκυστήρ ([Hippocr.] *de mulier. morb.* 1 = II, 702 Kühn), which was provided with a καμπή (Soran. 4, 10, 2 = 141, 8 Ilb.); cf. also Cels. 7, 29: *Tum si caput proximum est, demitti debet uncus undique levis* ("smooth (= blunt) on every side", ∞ *hebes uncus*), *acuminis brevis* (the καμπή), *qui vel oculo, vel auri, vel ori, interdum etiam fronti recte inicitur, deinde attractus infantem educit*. For photographs, see S. J. Kalthoff, *Die theoret. und prakt. Grundlagen der operativen Geburtshilfe der Hippokrateer* (Munich 1933), p. 27, im. 2/3, and P. Diepgen, *Die Frauenheilkunde der alten Welt* (Munich 1937), im. 55, 7. — **facinus**: we may perhaps translate 'horror', 'atrocité', and refer to Cic. *Phil.* 11, 10: *Lucium fratrem . . . quam facem . . . quod facinus!* However, it seems more probable that *facinus* means 'the victim <of the crime>'; the same sense occurs in Sen. *Phoeniss.* 363/4: *felix Agave: facinus horrendum* (viz. the head of Pentheus) *manu / qua fecerat, gestavit* (perhaps also Phaedr. *append.* 16, 7: *saeva societas* (sc. felium) *discerpsit dominum* (sc. gallum) *et fecit partes facinoris*); a parallel is furnished by the concrete sense of *infanticidium* = *infans caesus* in *apol.* 2, 5; *pecus* (Gelen.) of course is a conjecture, probably after the example of *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (491, 2): (Christus) *pecus* (= ἐμβρουον) *dictus post figuram* (= after the formation of the parts of the body; see the note on 37, 2). The word is frequently used in this sense by Muscio (1, 18. 44. 47; 2, 59/61; 63/4. 70) and Firm. Mat. (e.g. *math.* 7, 2, 8). — **atrahitur** (B): this reading is certainly possible, cf. Cels. 7, 29: *uncus . . . attractus infantem educit*; Muscio 2, 70: *cum pecus adducitur*; 2, 84: *cum infantem mortuum embryulcis adducimus* (Soran. ἐφέλκεσθαι); on the other hand, Cels., *loc. cit.*, also writes: *sed in pedes quoque conversus infans non difficulter extrahitur*, so that it seems preferable to retain the reading of A. — **violento puerperio**: according to Koch, this ablat. has the function of an apposition (see the note on 19, 5); since, however, these words correspond with *αναίω arbitrio*, his interpretation is far from probable. —

aeneum spiculum: this cannot be the ἐμβρυοθάλαστρος (for a photograph, see Meyer-Steinig, *op. cit.*, VI, 1), which was a kind of forceps. Probably Tert. means an instrument similar to the ἐμβρυοτόμος described by Soranus *gyn.* 4, 11, 3 (142, 10 *seqq.* IIb.): εἰ δὲ μείζονος τοῦ κεφαλίου ὑπάρχοντος ἢ σφήνωσις ἀποτελοῖτο, διὰ τοῦτο ἐμβρυοτόμου ἢ τοῦ πολυπικροῦ σπαθίου κρυπτομένου μεταξὺ λιχανοῦ καὶ τοῦ μικροῦ δακτύλου κατὰ τὴν ἐνθεσιν, εἰ μὲν ὑγροκέφαλον εἴη τὸ βρέφος, διακτεῖν (images: Kalthoff, 27, im. 6; Diepgen, im. 55, 8; Meyer-Steinig, IV, 6). According to Dölger, ACh 4 (1934), 47, Soranus makes a distinction between a crushing of the head by means of the ἐμβρυοτόμος and a section with the πολυπικρὸν σπαθίον; however, the appropriate instrument for this crushing was not the ἐμβρυοτόμος, but the ἐμβρυοθάλαστρος. [Hippocr.] *de mulier. morb.* 1 in this context mentions a μαχαίριον (σχίσαντα τὴν κεφαλὴν μαχαίρῳ ξυμφάσαι). The Greek name of the instrument has come corrupted in A (ΕΜΒΥΟΡΣΕΚΤΗΝ; the scribe may have thought of *secare*). Scaliger supposed ἐμβρυορήκτην (which should of course be ἐμβρυορρήκτην, but is not quite impossible); the conjecture of Latinus (ἐμβρυονέκτην) gives a very singular hybrid, and Gelenius' ἐμβρυορέκτην is not in keeping with the context. Since B has ἐμβρυοπάκτην, the most obvious solution is to follow Ursinus in writing ἐμβρυοσφάκτην (≈ *de infanticidii officio*). The *codex Laurentian. graec.* LXXIV, 2 (for which cf. H. Schöne, *Zwei Listen chirurgischer Instrumente*, Hermes 38 (1903), 280/4) mentions four gynaecological instruments, viz. the ἐμβρυουλκός, the ἐμβρυοτόμος, the ἐμβρυοθάλαστρος, and the ἐμβρυοσφάκτης. So the ἐμβρυοσφάκτης was not identical to the ἐμβρυοτόμος; nevertheless the two instruments must have been rather similar to each other, as the ἐμβρυοσφάκτης was a *spiculum*, and the ἐμβρυοτόμος "a big knife shaped like a myrtle-leaf with a long handle" (Meyer-Steinig, *op. cit.*, 34). Probably the ἐμβρυοσφάκτης was used only for the purpose of killing the embryo, whereas the ἐμβρυοτόμος (which in the passage just quoted from Soranus seems to have this function as well) was employed for the further dissection of the dead body. At all events, the last-mentioned instrument is not to be identified with the *anuloculter*, which must have been curved (for the same reason Dölger's supposition (*op. cit.*, 47) that the *anuloculter* and the πολυπικρὸν σπαθίον were identical must be wrong: the πολυπικρὸν σπαθίον was not curved, as is shown by the photograph in Meyer-Steinig, IV, 13). It remains very curious that Soranus does not mention instruments corresponding to the *anuloculter* and the ἐμβρυοσφάκτης. — **iugulatio** (before Tert. only [Caes.] *bell. Hisp.* 16, 4, 18, 9, 22, 6) seems to be a vulgar word, which for this very cause may have been chosen by Tert. in this context. — **caeco latrocinio**: cf. Min. Fel. 9, 5: *caecis . . . vulneribus* ("wounds inflicted in the dark"). — **infanticidii** (also *apol.* 2, 5; *ad nat.* 1, 15, 2): Tp, just as *infanticida* (*ad nat.* 1, 15, 3). — **peremptorium** (from *Apul. met.* 10, 11 downwards) also occurs in *pud.* 1 (220, 3), with a different sense. — **maiorum quoque prosector Herophilus**: see the note on 10, 4; cf. also Galen. *de uteri dissect.* (II, 895 Kühn): 'Ηρόφιλος τὴν πλείστην ἐπίγνωσιν οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀλόγων ζώων, καθάπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν

ἀνθρώπων πεποιημένος. It is highly improbable that it is Soranus who made mention of these physicians in this context; the list, which contains no name not mentioned in the foregoing chapters, only serves as an illustration, and must have been drawn up by Tert. himself. I cannot assume either that the words *et . . . ipse Soranus* have a special importance, as is supposed by Karpp, 34/5; at the utmost they may signify that Tert. owes the knowledge of the instruments just mentioned to Soranus. — **prosector**: ἄ. λ. — **mitior**: this does not mean that Soranus avoided the use of these instruments, but points out the contrast with *maiorum quoque prosector Herophilus*, and so refers to the aversion the methodical school felt against anatomy, for which cf. the note on 10, 4. — For **animal** = ζῷον, see the note on 1, 2. — **miserti**: B has *miserati*, which certainly is the *lectio difficilior*; *miserari* followed by a genit. of the object seems to occur for the first time in Sil. Ital. 11, 379 (it is, however, possible that it is to be found already in Acc. *trag.* 621 and Stat. *Theb.* 8, 23); other instances are found in Justin. 15, 3, 6; 43, 4, 8; Min. Fel. 28, 3; *Doctr. apost.* 5, 3 Schlecht (cf. Wohleb, 41); Iren. lat. 1, 18; 1, 28, 5; 3, 35, 2; 4, 44, 1 (with the dative 4, 29, 2); Prud. *perist.* 9, 85 and *psychom.* 580; Dracont. *laud. dei* 2, 757. 772; Aug. c. *Academ.* 3, 2, 2; *Novell. Justin.* 8 *edict. pr.*; Serv. auct. *ad Verg. georg.* 1, 222. However, as Tert. fairly often attaches an accus. to this verb and A has *miserti*, it seems advisable to prefer the latter reading. — **infantiae** = *infantium*, just as in 26, 2 and *ad nat.* 1, 7, 10: *tot infantiae trucidatae*. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 93 is certainly wrong in putting these passages on a level with Sen. *benef.* 6, 24, 1: *tenera infantia*, for *infantia* much more frequently means “children in general”; for this passage we may compare Vict. Vit. 1, 7; Ven. Fort. *virt. Hil.* 3, 6 and *vita Germ.* 1, 3. — **ut . . . lanietur**: this sentence may have been copied by the author of the *epistula de castitate* (4, 7, p. 129 Caspari): *provenit etiam tanta necessitas, ut, dum matri providetur, medicorum spiculis infantia* (the concrete sense again!) *innocens intra ipsius uteri secreta lanietur*. According to Tert., this dissection is carried out by means of the *anuloculter*.

6. **qua sceleris necessitate** is not to be considered as an instance of *enallage*, for in this passage *sceleris necessitas* is equivalent to *scelus necessarium*. — **Hicesius**: see the note on § 2. — **superducens** is frequently used by Tert. with the otherwise unusual sense of “to add”; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 139; *cult. fem.* 2, 5, 4; *adv. Prax.* 3 (231, 25); for more details, see Rönsch, *It.*², 200 and *Sem.*, 3, 80. — **quia respondens**: there is no necessity to change the text, for the use of a participle after *quia* is quite normal; cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 65; for *respondere*, see the note on 5, 4. The derivation of ψυχή from ψῦχος is a very common one. The earliest instances are Plato *Cratyl.* 399 D/E and Arist. *de anim.* 1, 2 (405b 28/9): οἱ δὲ τὸ ψυχρὸν διὰ τὴν ἀναπνοὴν καὶ τὴν κατάψυξιν καλεῖσθαι ψυχὴν; for the Stoa, see the note on § 2; cf. also Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 21, 3 (in connection with the Stoa) and 8, 10, 1; Jamblich. *de anim. ap. Stob. ecl.* 1, 41, 32 (represented as the view of τινες τῶν φυσικῶν); Dümmler, *Akademika*, 140. It plays

an important part in the psychology of Origen, e. g. *de princ.* 2, 8, 3 (160, 1 *seqq.* Koetschau): τὰ λογικὰ τὰ τῆς θείας ἀγάπης ἀποφυγέντα καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ψυχὰς ὀνομασθέντα; *ib.* p. 161, 2/3 and 157, 12 *seqq.* For more details about the theory of Origen, see Epiphan. *panar.* 64, 4; Hier. *ep.* 96, 17, 2; Theophil. Alex. *ep. paschal.* 2, 15 (quoted by Hier. *ep.* 98, 15); Justinian. *ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX, 492 D); Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 416/8. — For *censentur* = *nascuntur*, see 20, 1, for *quantae* = *quot*, 9, 6. — *colorem . . . excoctae*: for other instances of the *accus. Graecus* in Tert's works (also 28, 1: *probatus divinitatem*), see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 14; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 6/8 and *Synt.*, 17/8; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 3, 18 (406, 14/5): *Joseph, et ipse Christum figuratus* (M R; Kroymann after Engelbrecht *figuraturus*). — *Unde illis animam . . . ?*: the *accus. animam* (A) is certainly right, for the meaning is: "whence should they have souls?" (*unde illis anima?* would mean: "whence do they have souls?"). The earliest instance known to me of this use of an *accus.* in a question is [Caes.] *bell. Afric.* 4, 3: 'unde', inquit, 'istas' (sc. litteras)?; the next are Hor. *sat.* 2, 5, 102: *unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?* (on this passage Heinze observes: "der Affekt, aus dem diese Wendungen fliessen, begnügt sich mit der Nennung des Objekts, auf das es ihm allein ankommt, und nimmt sich nicht die Mühe, das Prädikat auszudenken, das nur ganz unbestimmt vorschwebt") and 2, 7, 116. Other instances are found in Ovid *her.* 12, 84; Sen. *Herc. fur.* 296/7; *de tranq. anim.* 5, 1; Lucan. 7, 28; Iuven. 14, 56; *Vulg. Matth.* 15, 33: *unde . . . nobis . . . panes tantos* (ἄποτοι)?; *It. (cod. Bob.) Matth.* 13, 54: *Unde huic sapientiam istam et virtutes?* (the interpretation given by Hoogterp, 63/4, is wrong); Quint. *declam. min.* p. 187, 1 *seq.* Ritter; *ib.* 204, 14/5; Pacian. *ep.* 3, 3; *Querolus* p. 57, 17 Peiper; Paul. Nol. *carm.* 27, 313; Fulgent. *Mitol.* 1 *praef.* (11, 18/9 Helm); Ambrst. *in 2 Tim.* 4, 13; Optat. Milev. *de schism. Donat.* 2, 6; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T., qu.* 108; for the Panegyrists, see Chruzander, 114. In *ep. de mal. doctor.* 16, 2 (p. 95 Caspari): *unde ergo tibi eius rei scientia*, we should perhaps follow cod. C in writing *scientiam*. To these several passages may be added where it is not possible to decide whether we are to assume a *nomin.* or an *accus.*, e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 11, 13: *unde enim . . . vires?*; *Paneg.* 12, 1, 1; 12, 11, 3 (from this treatise cf. 19, 9: *unde illi iudicium . . . ?*; 18, 7; 43, 12). This *accus.* is much more frequently found in questions beginning with *quo* (the earliest instances occur in Varro *sat. Menipp.* 588 Bücheler and Cic. *Verr.* II 2, 137; cf. Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.*, 2, 433; Müller, *Synt. des Nom. u. Akkus.*, 160/1); from Tert's writings we may quote *adv. Marc.* 5, 18 (641, 24): *quo iam mihi duos deos, si una est disciplina?*, *bapt.* 11, 3: *quo ergo illi praecursorem?* (perhaps *adv. Marc.* 4, 42 (564, 8/9): *quo iam testimonium vestimentorum?*), and the frequent quotations of Is. 1, 11: *quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum?* (*orat.* 28 (198, 20/1); *adv. Marc.* 2, 18 (360, 13); 2, 22 (365, 12; cf. 366, 1/2); *adv. Iud.* 5, 47/8). — *cubiculares aestus*: nothing corresponding to this is found in Soran. *gyn.* For *paraturam*, see the note on 2, 3. — *periculum est* instead of *periculo est* is to be regarded as a poetical expression or as a Graecism (Soran. κίνδυνός ἐστι!);

cf. Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 160/4; Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 345; Klotz's note on [Caes.] *bell. Hispan.* 38, 4; for Ovid, see Bednara, 572 and Hau, *De casuum usu Ovidiano* (Münster i. W. 1884), 58/61; for such cases as *finis est = finiendum est*, see Lyngby, *Cels.*, 40. — **In ipsis paene balneis**: for this designation of excessive heat, cf. e. g. Sen. *ep.* 86, 10: *... utilem ac salubrem temperaturam* (sc. in balneis), *non hanc, quae nuper inventa est similis incendio, adeo quidem, ut convictum in aliquo scelere servum vivum lavari oporteat. nihil mihi videtur iam interesse, ardeat balineum an caleat.* — **statim vagitus auditur**: this is, of course, a refutation of the Stoic view (§ 2): (*substantiam carnis*) *aeris rigore percussam et vim animalem rapere et vocalem sonum reddere.*

7. **aeris rigor**: see the immediately preceding note. As far as I know, the expression *thesaurus animae* is found nowhere else: see the note on 20, 6: *fons animarum*. — **Germanias**: this word is really used in a plural sense (cf. e. g. Suet. *Domit.* 2: *in Galliam Germaniasque*), whereas the plural *Scythias* is due to assimilation, just as in Catull. 3, 1: *Veneres Cupidinesque*; Culex 351: *soles et sidera cuncta*; Tibull. 2, 3, 1: *rura meam ... tenent villaeque puellam*, etc. — **ingenia expeditiora**: for this view (which is found from [Arist.] *problem.* 14, 15 downwards: διὰ τί οἱ ἐν τοῖς θερμοῖς τόποις σφοδρώτεροι εἰσιν ἢ ἐν τοῖς ψυχροῖς;), see Trüdinger, *Stud. z. ant. Ethnographie*, 53. From Latin literature we may adduce Vitruv. 6, 1, 10: *meridianae nationes animis acutissimis.* — **Sarmatis etiam mente torpentibus**, not only *corpore*, for among them, according to Tert.'s lively description of Marcion's native country (*adv. Marc.* 1, 1), *omnia torpent, omnia rigent*. Cf. also Amm. Marc. 22, 5, 5: *o Marcomanni, o Quadi, o Sarmatae, tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni*; Corp. Herm., Exc. XXIV, 14 (504, 10/2 Scott): ὁ δὲ βορέας τῇ συμφύτῳ ψυχρῇ ἀποπήσσει μετὰ τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τὸν νοῦν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων. *friguscilis* is ἄ. λ. The motivation *cum substantia enim et vis* is completely in keeping with Tert.'s usual way of arguing (see the note on 10, 9).

8. **praestructis**: cf. 18, 5. — **Liberi aliqui et Scipiones**: "such as Bacchus and Scipio"; the plural is employed, because Bacchus and Scipio are adduced as the representatives of a special kind of men; for the use of the plural of proper names, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 371; Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 35; for Arnob., cf. Gabarrou, 95. With regard to Bacchus, see the article by F. A. Voigt, Roscher, 1, 1045; the note about Scipio may have been borrowed by Tert. from Plin. *n. h.* 7, 47: *auspicatius enectae parente gignuntur. sic Scipio Africanus prior natus primusque Caesarum a caeso matris utero dictus* (cf. Dölger, *ACh* 4 (1934), 48/9). — **Quodsi qui**: after *si* and *ne* we often find *qui* instead of *quis*; see the detailed discussion by Löfstedt, *Synt.*, 2, 79/96; for Cic., cf. W. Kroll, *Glotta* 3 (1912), 3 (many instances may be added, e. g. *Rosc. Amer.* 1, 2; *Tusc.* 4, 8, 17; 4, 20, 46; *de leg. agr.* 1, 9, 27). Tert. makes a very frequent use of *si qui* and *ne qui* (a few examples are adduced by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 105₁). For more details, see Hoogterp, 163; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 159/60; Ebert, 328; Tidn., *Did.*, 30;

Juret, *Filastr.*, 36; Chruzander, 91/2; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 21; Väänänen, 207/8 (the find-spot of the Pompeian inscriptions where *si qui* occurs seems to show that this is a more vulgar form than *si quis*). — **ut Plato**: who regarded the soul as *extraneam . . . et extorrem uteri* (§ 2). That Plato made use of this argument to demonstrate that the foetus is not an animate being is mentioned nowhere else, nor is it probable that Tert. owes this note to any of his sources (the statement that two bodies cannot possibly be in the same place at the same time, was made for the first time by Aristotle; see the note on 6, 8); it is more obvious that, after his confutation of the *philosophia quae duo in unum corpora negavit* (6, 8; there, too, Tert. by *philosophia* seems to have meant Plato in the first place, as the whole chapter is levelled at him, and in ch. 4 he is called *philosophus* without more), he now in this context ascribes to Plato a similar argument, which may easily be confuted by referring to the earlier discussion of this subject, the case of Socrates, and two scriptural texts. — **cum anima conserta**: the reading of A B (*ut cum*) is defended by Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 66), who translates “wie mit der Seele verwachsen” and remarks: “es ist das etwas mehr als *in unum convenientia* oder *in unum congesta*”. Against this we may point out that in another passage Tert. uses *conserere* in the same context without qualifying it as a metaphorical expression by the addition of (*vel*)*ut*, viz. 11, 6: *si neque dei neque diaboli spiritus ex nativitate conseritur animae*. As regards Hartel’s remark that it is not likely that *ut* was inserted here as an interpolation, we may draw attention to the repeated use of *ut* in the latter part of this sentence. — Instead of **daemonis** Hartel writes *daemonia* with the following motivation: “es wäre hart, um *daemonis* halten zu können, *animam* in Gedanken zu ergänzen, und diese Ergänzung nicht richtig, sowohl mit Rücksicht auf den Schlusssatz, wo die Verbindung der Seele mit der Seele und der Seele mit dem bösen Geist unterschieden wird, und mit Rücksicht auf *verum et multa alia* (*sic*), worauf doch nicht *animam daemonis* folgen könnte”. The remark that after *daemonis* we are not to supply mentally *animam*, is right (the same view is held by Mr. Borleffs, who was kind enough to communicate to me his interpretation of this passage, which I regard as the right one). Tert. argues that a soul (viz. a human soul, as is shown by the context; cf. the words *ego . . . fetibus*) may be united with ‘another <human> soul’ as well as with ‘many other things, e. g. *daemonis*’. At the end of the sentence a more detailed description of these possibilities is found: in the first case we have to do with a *societas substantiae*, in the second, viz. when a *spiritus nequam* (≈ *daemonis*) is added to the soul, with a *diversitas naturae* (≈ *substantiae*, cf. the note on 9, 6; the choice of *natura* is either due to the *clausula* or to the desire for variation). So a demon is described as a being completely different from a human soul; but if this is true, it is impossible to understand *animam* after *daemonis*, especially because the immediately preceding *anima* denotes a human soul. It may also be pointed out that, according to Tert., the demons, who by him are called *substantiae spiritales* (*apol.* 22, 1) and only

possess this substance, can hardly be said to have souls, and still less to be souls (*quae apud nos in homine privata res est*, 19, 2; yet the latter view is found once, viz. in Max. Tyr. 9, 5: εἰπέρ ἐστιν τὸ δαιμόνιον αὐτὸ ψυχὴ ἀποδυσσάμενῃ τὸ σῶμα). On the other hand, Hartel's conjecture *daemonia* raises an insuperable difficulty on account of the subsequent genitives *unius* and *septenarii spiritus*; at most these might be interpreted as *genitivi qualitatis*, and in the case of the genit. *legionarii numeri* this is possible indeed, but what could be meant by a *daemonium unius spiritus*, if Tert. regards *daemon(ium)* as equivalent to *spiritus*? (cf. also Lohmeyer's note on Apoc. 16, 14 πνεύματα δαιμόνων (*Hdb. N. T.* 16, p. 133): "Der Gen. bei πνεύματα ist definierend wie Luc. 4, 33 (πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου); denn Dämonen haben nicht Geister, sondern sind Geister"). Only one possible interpretation remains: the demon joins the human soul, and *alia multa* join the human soul; hence *daemonis* should be put on a level with *alia multa*. For all this it is not clear which kind of genit. is to be assumed here. We may translate: "many other things, viz. things which have to do with a demon" (which is almost equivalent to "viz. a demon", just as in Greek τὰ δαίμονος is put instead of δαίμων; Mr. Borleffs thinks this interpretation the most plausible one); we may, however, also consider the possibility that we must supply *substantiam*: the end of the sentence (*quo facilius anima cum anima conseretur ex societate substantiae*) shows that in this passage *anima* for Tert. is equivalent to *substantia animae* (we may also think of the definition of the demons as *substantiae spiritalis*); hence it seems not altogether out of the question that in writing *daemonis* he forgot that in the immediately preceding part of this sentence he had not yet written *animae substantia*, but only *anima*. — *Socrate*: for Tert.'s view that the δαιμόνιον of Socrates was a δαίμων πάρεδρος, see the notes on 1, 4 and 39, 3. — *legionarii numeri*: from Marc. 5, 9 (Luc. 8, 27 *seqq.*); similarly *fuga* 2, 6: *diaboli legio*. The passage has been fully discussed by Tert. in *adv. Marc.* 4, 20 (484, 23 *seqq.*). — *quo facilius*, etc.: the circumstantiality of the argument is typical of Tert. After the exposition of the *argumentum a fortiori* it would have sufficed to say: *quo facilius anima cum anima conseretur*; instead of this, Tert. repeats the entire antithesis and elucidates it by the addition of *ex societate substantiae . . . ex diversitate naturae*. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (293, 5/6): *habuit* (sc. Marcion) *et Cerdonem quendam informatorem scandalii huius, quo facilius duos deos caeci perspexisse se existimaverunt*, where Kroymann writes *duo* instead of *quo* (for the right interpretation, see Bill, 15). — *ex societate substantiae . . . ex diversitate naturae*: the first *ex* also denotes the cause, whereas the latter only indicates the starting-point.

9. in sexto Legum: 775 B/C: πίνειν δὲ εἰς μέθην οὔτε ἄλλοθι ποῦ πρέπει . . . οὐδ' ἀσφαλές, οὐτ' οὖν δὴ περὶ γάμους ἐσπουδακότα, ἐν οἷς ἔμφρονα μάλιστα εἶναι πρέπει νύμφην καὶ νυμφίον μεταβολὴν οὐ σμικρὰν βίου μεταλλάττοντας, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ὅπως ὃ τι μάλιστα ἐξ ἐμφρόνων αἰεὶ γίγνηται . . . καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις δεῖ μὴ τῶν σωμάτων διακεχυμένων ὑπὸ μέθης γίγνεσθαι τὴν παιδουργίαν, ἀλλ'

εὐπαγές ἀπλανές ἡσυχᾶόν τε ἐν μοίρᾳ ξυνίστασθαι τὸ φυόμενον . . . διὸ μᾶλλον μὲν ὅλον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ βίον χρή, μάλιστα δὲ ὁπόσον ἂν γεννᾷ χρόνον, εὐλαβεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ πράττειν μήτε ὅσα νοσώδη ἐκόντα εἶναι μήτε ὅσα ὕβρεως ἢ ἀδικίας ἐχόμενα· εἰς γὰρ τὰς τῶν γεννημένων ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα ἀναγκαῖον ἐξομοργνύμενον ἐκτυποῦσθαι καὶ τίκτειν πάντη φασυλότερα· διαφερόντως δὲ ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. The words *ex aliqua vilitate concubitus* of course refer to καὶ μὴ πράττειν . . . ἀδικίας ἐχόμενα. The passage is frequently adduced, paraphrased, or copied: [Ocell. Lucan.] *de univ. nat.* 52 *seqq.* (23, 21 *seqq.* Harder), especially 56 (24, 15 *seqq.*; cf. Harder's note, p. 133); Plut. *de lib. educ.* 3 (1 D) and *conjug. praec.* 42 (144 B); Athen. 10, 39 (431 F); Aristoxen. *ap. Stob. ecl.* 4, 37, 4 (879, 10/4 Hense); Euseb. *praep. evang.* 3, 1 (81 D; from Plut.); Jamblich. *vit. Pyth.* 211/2; for Posidonius, see Galen *de plac. Hippocr. et Plat.* p. 445, 5/15 Müller (cf. Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrb.*, Suppl. 24 (1898), 622/3). Soranus also gives a similar instruction (*gyn.* 1, 38/9, especially 1, 39, 2 (27, 36 Ilberg): νηφétωσαν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν τοῖς πλησιασμοῖς); it is possible that in Περὶ ψυχῆς he referred to the passage from Plato. Since the doxographical survey in § 2 was almost certainly borrowed by Tert. from the same treatise, it is not out of the question that Soranus accused Plato of inconsistency; but, on the other hand, we are not to lose sight of the fact that the passage from the Laws seems to have been generally known, so that Tert. may have been acquainted with it long before he consulted Soranus. — **in sexto Legum**: similarly, *apol.* 16, 2 (Fuld.): *Tacitus . . . in quarto Historiarum* (Vulg.: *in quinta H.*); cf. Senn., *Pallad.*, 137; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 43; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 53. — **monens cavere**: the infin. after *monere* (which is found already in Cic., e. g. *de fin.* 1, 66) is used especially by poets (see Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarb.*,⁷, s. v.); for Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 46, for more details, Hofm., *Synt.*, 580, Kühner-Stegm., 1, 682, Goelz., *Jér.*, 364, Lavarenne, 238/9, Hoogterp, 201, and the literature quoted by Konjetzny, 343₅. — **vilitate concubitus** instead of *vili concubitu*, probably on account of the clausula (1³ γ). — **supparare** (also 30, 5; *iei.* 4 (278, 29); *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 1); *adv. Val.* 4 (181, 16) and 14 (193, 7); *cult. fem.* 2, 7, 2) occurs only in Tert.'s works. — **pristina** (B) is the correct reading, for Tert. means the *prior sententia* mentioned in § 2. — **sibi exciderit**: "has gone back upon his word"; similarly, *pud.* 19 (265, 8/10): *iuxta est igitur, ut excidisse sibi dicamus Iohannem in primore quidem epistula negantem nos sine delicto esse, nunc vero praescribentem non delinquere omnino*; *adv. Prax.* 1 (227, 8); *Iren. lat.* 4, 44, 3; *excidere de (ab)* = "to break faith with": *pud.* 12 (242, 27/8); 19 (265, 12/3); *apol.* 46, 17; 49, 6; *spect.* 8 (10, 16/7) and 26 (26, 3/4); *ad Scap.* 3; *adv. Herm.* 39 (169, 5); *res.* 52 (107, 12); *v. v.* 7; *adv. Marc.* 3, 4 (381, 3): — **ens ab optimi dei titulo** ("aus der Rolle fallend" Hoppe, *Synt.*, 131); *ib.* 4, 17 (476, 1); = "to lose" *adv. Iud.* 2, 27; *v. v.* 14; *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 (295, 12); — **it mihi** = "I forget": *adv. Marc.* 4, 11 (449, 5): *excidit ei vel de Petro* (see for this passage Hoppe, *loc. cit.*, note 2); *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 1; *ad nat.* 2, 12, 5; *iei.* 6 (280, 14/6): *nemo . . .*

recordabitur dei eo in tempore, quo ipsum sibi hominem excidere sollemne est. In this passage we should either expect *de pristina . . . sententia exciderit* or only *sibi exciderit*; hence *de* is to be translated here by 'with regard to'. — Though *oro te* is very frequent in Tert., *oro*, the reading of A, may be retained: cf. *test. anim.* 5 (141, 19); *ad nat.* 1, 7, 1; 2, 12, 20; *pud.* 16 (254, 19). — *animae quoque*, sc. *sicut etiam corporis*. The sentence (= *St. V. F.* 1, frag. 518) has been repeated from 5, 4. This argument was rejected by Vincentius Victor, who in general adopted Tert.'s psychological views; see Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 2, 6, 10. — *genituram*: see 23, 5. — *dirigebant* A B, *digerebant* Gel. ("recte, ut videtur", Thes. I. L. VI, 2: 1825, 84). We may, however, refer to *res.* 22 (55, 7/9): *ordinem temporum primo Iudaicorum usque ad excidium Hierusalem, dehinc communium usque ad conclusionem saeculi dirigit* (sc. dominus), where all the MSS have *dirigit*, but Kroymann follows Gelenius in writing *digerit*. In several other places *dirigere* is almost synonymous with *digerere* (though not as clearly as in the present passage and in the passage just quoted), e. g. *ad nat.* 2, 9, 10: *ipsos in duas species dirigimus* (here Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 57 thinks the reading *digerimus* quite possible); *adv. Prax.* 2 (229, 29 seq.): (Oikonomia) *quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens* ("contendens esse" Kroymann) *patrem et filium et spiritum*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (302, 21/2): *hinc itaque constantissime dirigam deum non esse, qui sit hodie incertus*; probably also *orat.* 5 (184, 14/5): *nam utique ultio illorum* (sc. martyrum) *a saeculi fine dirigitur*; for the cognate sense 'to interpret', see the note on 1,6. — For the emphasis laid on the moment of conception in astrology, see Boll-Bezold-Gundel, *Stern Glaube und Sterndeutung*³, 153/4; 168; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 198; cf. also Aug. *civ. dei* 5, 1 seqq.; Philo *de provid.* 1, 87; Hippolyt. *refut.* 4, 3, 5/11 (the Περαιτικοί); Orig. *ap. Euseb. praep. evang.* 6, 11 (291 B). — *ad . . . flatus*: on this sentence Lindner observes: "ad eam i. e. genituram, pertinet, si quid est, i. e. si momenti est ad vitam, flatus, non aliunde infanti accedit, sed nascitur cum infante". This interpretation points in the direction of a right solution. *Quam* cannot possibly refer to *anima*, for the essence of the soul is a *flatus* in itself. Tert. seems to mean that it is not the air (*flatus*) penetrating into the body at birth (§ 2) which creates the soul, but the *flatus* which is active at the moment of conception, viz. the *destillatio animae* (27, 6; cf. also 27, 8) contained in the sperm: "the flatus is no less concerned with conception <than with birth>".

26. *Scriptural texts also demonstrate that the embryo is an animate being.*

"After giving an advice to philosophers and physicians, I now proceed to the furnishing of convincing proofs from Holy Scripture to my Christian readers (§ 1), viz. the cases of Esau and Jacob (Gen. 25, 22 seq.; §§ 2/3), Jesus and John the Baptist (Luc. 1, 41. 46; § 4), and Jeremiah (Jer. 1, 5; § 5)".

In making use of scriptural texts for the purpose of demonstrating that the embryo has a soul, Tert. has a predecessor in the anonym-

ous author quoted by Clem. Alex. *ecl. prophet.* 50, 1/3: "Ἐλεγεν πρεσβύτες ζῶον εἶναι τὸ κατὰ γαστρός. Εἰσιούσαν γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν μήτραν ἀπὸ τῆς καθάρσεως ἡντρεπισμένην εἰς σύλληψιν καὶ εἰσκριθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τινος τῶν τῇ γενέσει ἐφεστώτων ἀγγέλων προγινώσκοντος τὸν καιρὸν τῆς συλλήψεως κινεῖν πρὸς συνουσίαν τὴν γυναικα, καταβληθέντος δὲ τοῦ σπέρματος ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐξοικειοῦσθαι τὸ ἐν τῷ σπέρματι πνεῦμα καὶ οὕτως συλλαμβάνεσθαι τῇ πλάσει . . . Μαρτύριον ὠνόμασεν πᾶσιν. Καὶ ὁπηνίκα ἂν εὐαγγελίζωνται οἱ ἄγγελοι τὰς στεῖρας, οἷον προεισκρίνουσι τῆς συλλήψεως τὰς ψυχάς (Luc. 1, 13) · καὶ ἐν <τῷ εὐ> αγγελίῳ, τὸ βρέφος ἐσκήρτησεν' ὡς ἔμψυχον (Luc. 1, 41), * * καὶ αἱ στεῖραι διὰ τοῦτο εἰσι στεῖραι, ὡς ἂν μὴ εἰσκρινομένης τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν τοῦ σπέρματος καταβολὴν συναγοῦσης εἰς κατοχὴν συλλήψεως καὶ γεννήσεως. The passage has been discussed in detail by F. J. Dölger, ACh 4 (1934), 28/32, who regards this πρεσβύτες as a Christian Platonist.

In later times these scriptural passages have frequently been used by the defenders of creatianism and of the previous existence of the soul, e. g. Orig. *de princ.* 2, 9, 7: *Igitur sicut de Esau et Iacob diligentius perscrutatis scripturis invenitur quia non est iniustitia apud deum, ut antequam nascerentur vel agerent aliquid in hac scilicet vita, diceretur quia 'maior serviet minori', et ut invenitur non esse iniustitia quod et in ventre fratrem suum supplantavit Iacob, si ex praecedentis videlicet vitae meritis digne eum dilectum esse sentiamus a deo, ita ut et fratri praeponi mereretur; ib.* 1, 7, 4; 3, 3, 5; 3, 4, 2 (see also the fragment translated by Hier. which has been preserved by Rufin. *apol.* 1, 28). Besides, Jer. 1, 5 is quoted in support of creatianism by Leo Magn. *ep.* 15, 9 and Aug. *serm.* 26, 1 (cf. also the thorough discussion of this passage in *de gen. ad litt.* 6, 9, 14). The author of the so-called "*Altercatio S. Ambrosii contra eos qui animam non confitentur esse facturam, aut ex traduce esse dicunt*" (Caspari, *Kirchenhistor. Anekdot.* 227/9) makes use of this same passage in conjunction with Exod. 21, 22 (see the note on 37, 2) and arrives at this conclusion: *vides ergo figuratum in utero animam accipere.*

1. **Omnis . . . terminos:** Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 55) translates: "Doch die Meinungen der Menschen ausserhalb der Grenzen der Offenbarung zeigen nichts als lauter Abweichungen". For this use of *omnis*, he refers to *adv. Marc.* 2, 15 (355, 27): *omnis providentia dei* "die vollkommene Voraussicht Gottes"; *pud.* 16 (254, 2): *omnem notitiam apostoli* "eine ganz erschöpfende Erkenntnis vom Apostel"; *res.* 25 (61, 25): *sub omni clausula temporum* "beim völligen Abschluss der Zeiten"; *apol.* 11, 5; 50, 15; *ad nat.* 1, 16, 3; *adv. Marc.* 4, 6 (433, 3): *magnam et omnem differentiam* (we may add 28, 2: *ad omnem mortui veteris horrorem*). All the same for this passage another translation seems preferable, viz. "But all this confusion of <merely> human opinions <only> extends to the limits of <the word of> God" = "ceases to exist, as soon as we come to Holy Scripture". We would subscribe to Thörnell's interpretation, if the *inaequalitas* had been mentioned for the first time here; this, however, is not the case, for this word

certainly refers to 25, 9: *nescio de pristina magis an de ista sententia sibi exciderit* (cf. also ch. 1/3). Moreover, Tert. emphasizes the words *usque ad dei terminos* more strongly than *omnis*, and our interpretation gives a more natural transition to the next sentence (*In . . . colligam*). For *inaequalitas*, cf. *fuga* 7, 1; *iei.* 14 (293, 9/10); *adv. Marc.* 4, 3 (428, 9/10). — *sententiae humanae*: which, as compared with the *sententia divina*, is of no value; cf. *mon.* 3: *ostendit illa quae supra dixerat non dominicae auctoritatis fuisse, sed humanae aestimationis*; *apol.* 45, 1: *a deo edocti . . .* 45, 2 *humana aestimatio*; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 15: *in arbitrio et libidine sententiae humanae*; for the alternation of an adjunct. (*humanae*) and a genit. (*dei*), see Sörbom, 87/8; Gabarrou, 198; Spindler, 50; Havers, 121. — *dei terminos* was probably translated rightly by Thörnell: “the limits of God’s Revelation” (cf. *nostras lineas*). All the same, we should perhaps not lose sight of the meaning ‘ordinance’, ‘rule’ (probably influenced by Gr. *ῥπος*, see Tidn., *Did.*, 254) either, which is discussed by Tidner, *Eran.* 36 (1938), 76/8. From Tert. he adduces *pud.* 13 (245, 16/9): *Hymenaei autem et Alexandri crimen si et in isto et in futuro aevo inremissibile est, blasphemia scilicet, utique apostolus non adversus terminum domini sub spe veniae dedisset satanae* (Oehl. *ad loc.*: “hoc est adversus sententiam et determinationem domini”); *fuga* 13, 2: *omnium iam nunc dominicarum <pronuntiationum> suae sunt et causae et regulae; termini non in infinitum nec ad omnia spectant*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 26 (512, 12): *ceterum quomodo adhuc staret regnum eius* (sc. *Satanae*) *in suis terminis et legibus et officiis?*; *ib.* 5, 19 (645, 10/2): *sed Marcion principalem suae fidei terminum de Epicuri schola agnoscat* (here *terminus* is almost equivalent to ‘dogma’); perhaps we may add *pud.* 2 (223, 25/6): *porro et auctoritas scripturae in suis terminis stabit sine alterutra oppositione*. Hence the best solution seems to be that in this passage, though the original sense of *terminus* is still vividly felt (cf. *praescr.* 10, 10/2: *hanc tibi fossam* (= *finem quaerendi*) *determinavit ipse, qui te non vult aliud credere quam quod instituit, ideoque nec quaerere*), we must also reckon with the meaning ‘the firmly established ordinances of God’. — **In nostras . . . problem:** “the evidence furnished by scriptural texts is of value for Christian readers only”; Tert. avoids the mistake of Cypr. blamed by Lact. *div. inst.* 5, 1: *hic tamen placere ultra verba sacramentum ignorantibus non potest, quoniam mystica sunt, quae locutus est, et ad id praeparata, ut a solis fidelibus audiantur. denique a doctis huius saeculi, quibus forte scripta eius innotuerunt, derideri solet*, and 5, 4 (with regard to Cypr. *Ad Demetrianum*): *non enim scripturae testimoniis, quam ille* (sc. *Demetrianus*) *utique vanam, fictam, commenticiam putabat, sed argumentis et ratione fuerat refellendus*. Tert.’s point of view has been stated with perfect clearness in *cor.* 7, 14 *seqq.*: *Video igitur et curiosius et plenius agendum ab originibus usque ad profectus et excessus rei* (sc. *usus coronarum*). *Litterae ad hoc saeculares necessariae. De suis enim instrumentis saecularia probari necesse est* (a similar statement is made by Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 1, 6). Still we should not forget that Tert. regards the evidence furnished in this chapter as much more valuable than his discussion of the same matter in ch. 25, as

is shown by the antithesis *respondi . . . probem* and, moreover, by many statements in his other writings collected by Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 248/74. Lortz is wrong in supposing (p. 250) that this chapter opens the second part of the whole treatise, and that this part was intended for Christian readers; ch. 26 only forms the beginning of the 'Christian' discussion on the soul of the embryo, which discussion fills ch. 25/7 (cf. also Naumann, 318₃₀). — *lineas*: "Metaphora locutionis sumpta de circo, ubi sulco impresso aut colore aliquo insperso praescribebantur certae lineae intra quas depugnandum esset" (Oehler (I, 506) in his note on *scorp.* 4); cf. Otto, *Sprichw.*, 194; Weyman, A. L. L. 8, 30/1; Sonny, *ib.*, 9, 67. Tert. makes a very extensive use of this metaphor (see Oehler, *loc. cit.*); the same is to be said of Hier., who probably here, too, copied Tert. (e. g. *adv. Lucifer* 4. 11; *adv. Pelag.* 3, 6; *adv. Rufin.* 3, 14). — *respondi*: a law term ('to give an advice'); see Beck, 41/2. *responsum* is used with the same meaning in *adv. Marc.* 4, 25 (507, 15); see also comm. on 6, 6. — *aedifica*: the original meaning is still felt here as in *apol.* 23, 18: *spei nostrae fidentiam aedificant*; *idol.* 10 (40, 24): *hinc prima diabolo fides aedificatur*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 1 (333, 10); *cult. fem.* 1, 6, 1 (*adv. Marc.* 1, 8 = 300, 1): *stuporem aedificare*. The signification 'to edify', which is found in Christian literature only (see for this sense Thes. 1. L. I: 926, 4 *seqq.*; Teeuwen, 129/30; Dibelius' note on Eph. 2, 20, *Hdb. N. T.* 12, p. 53/4; Ph. Vielhauer, *Oikodome*, Karlsruhe-Durlach 1939), is extremely rare in Tert.'s writings (to my knowledge, the only instance to be found is *cult. fem.* 2, 11, 2: *ut exemplo sitis, ut aedificentur in vobis*). The same is the case with *aedificatio* (see Thes. 1. L. I: 917, 64/918, 46), which in most cases has retained its original meaning, e. g. *res.* 45 (92, 22; cf. Eph. 4, 29): *ad-nem fidei*, and *adv. Marc.* 5, 17 (637, 25); the typically 'Christian' sense is found only in *pat.* 5 (6, 11/2): *loquacitas in aedificatione nulla turpis*; *paen.* 5, 8; *cult. fem.* 1, 3, 3. An adjunct. *aedificatorius* 'edifying' (Tp) is found in 47, 2. — *aspice* is frequently used by Tert. to introduce an example (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 99); for the same use made of *conspice* by Lucifer Calaurit., see Thörn., *Stud. Lucif.*, 10₂. — *prophetantes*: with regard to Esau and Jacob this is not true, for they did not prophesy, but were a prophecy in themselves.

2. *aeris nullus impulsus*: this remark is levelled at the Stoics (cf. 25, 2). — *nusquam adhuc*: cf. *adv. Herm.* 3 (129, 15/6): '*deus*' solummodo ponit . . . et nusquam adhuc dominus; Novat. *de trin.* 28: *et cum adhuc crux nusquam esset*. — *populi duo*: Tert. adopts the interpretation of Gen. 25, 22 *seq.* given by St. Paul in Rom. 9, 12/3 (cf. also *adv. Iud.* 1, 22 *seqq.*; *pud.* 8 = 235, 6/7), which in patristic literature remained the usual one. To my knowledge, a different exegesis of this text is only found in [Caes. Arelat.] *serm.* 162, 3 Morin: *Modo enim tamquam in uno coetu et in uno corpore ecclesiae mali et boni constituti sunt, quomodo in utero Rebeccae duo parvuli se in typo ecclesiae conldebant*. Very remarkable are Fulgentius' words in *de aet. mundi et homin.* 5 (144, 13/9 Helm): *Monstrat nondum homo* (note the difference from

Tert.'s view) *sui cordis invidiam; nam cui adhuc vita non fuit, livoris toxicum nondum natus adsumsit. Numquidnam divina iustitia in matris vulva prior formatur invidia quam figura? aut quo livor in loco habitaculum accipit, ubi adhuc anima non fuit? Nascitur parvus qui nasci voluit primus; optavit primordia si possit vinci natura.* — *infantiae*: this subst. once more has concrete sense; see comm. on 25, 5. — *animosae quam animatae*: cf. 19, 9. — *partus aperitur* seems to be a poetical phrase; it is also found in Hor. *carm. saec.* 13: *maturos aperire partus*; Nemesian. *Cyneg.* 125; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 40. *Partus* here has the meaning of *vulva*, cf. LXX Gen. 29, 31: ἡνοῖξε τὴν μήτραν αὐτῆς (Vulg. *aperuit vulvam eius*); the same meaning is assumed by Stam for Prud. *Hamart.* 599: *progeniem* (sc. *viperarum*), *saepti rumpentem obstacula partus* (Bergman, however, interprets: '*fetus vi concreta*') and *cathem.* 7, 59: *partu de senili effusus est* (here this sense is highly questionable). — *auguratus* only in this place means 'augury', 'portent' (Thes. l. L. II: 1369, 16/7).

3. *qui praevenerat nasci*: for the use of the infin., cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 58₁ (we may, however, doubt if it is right to follow him in interpreting this construction as a Grecism, as it is also possible to compare the use of *occupo* with an infin., which occurs from Plaut. downwards; Hofm., *Synt.*, 580). For the way of connecting the three partic. *praevenito*, *necdum* . . . *edito*, *tantum* . . . *nato*, cf. comm. on 27, 1. — *de prima aspiratione* . . . *Stoica forma*: cf. 25, 2. — *plantam fratris invaserat*: Tert. frequently attaches an accus. to *invadere*, e. g. 35, 5: *haereticos Heliae* . . . *invadere exemplum*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (559, 15); *apol.* 37, 2; *paen.* 2, 14. 4, 2 (*i. paenitentiam*); *ad nat.* 1, 18, 3; *cor.* 4, 10/1: *si Rebecca conspecto procul sponso velamen invasit*. In *pall.* 5, 6 the verb means *devorare* (see comm. on 31, 4: *inruerat*). This passage seems to have been copied by Hier. *de Exod. in vig. Pasch. (Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 410, 8): *necubi serpens plantam gradientis invadat*. — *calens matre* is interpreted in Thes. l. L. III: 147, 83/4 as *calens in utero matris*; it is, however, more plausible that *matre* is a separative ablat. (Germ.: 'warm von der Mutter her'; cf. such Dutch expressions as 'heet van de naald'). Cf. Prud. *psychom.* 216/7: *natalibus horis totum hominem et calidos a matre ampleximur artus*; Basil. *homil. in Ps.* 114 (P. G. 29, 489 C): (τὰ βρέφη) ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ θερμότητος τῷ ἄερι περιψυχόμενα. To a certain extent we may also compare Varro *de re rust.* 2, 8, 2: *pullum asininum a partu recentem*; Verg. *Aen.* 6, 450: *recens a vulnere Dido*; Cypr. *ep.* 64, 4 (719, 18 H.): *etsi adhuc infans a partu novus est* (see Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 123); Iuven. 7, 196: *adhuc a matre rubentem*; Donat. *ad Ter. Andr.* 3, 2, 6: *adhuc* . . . *a matre sanguinolentum*. — *se* . . . *cupiebat*: for the accus. c. *inf.*, cf. the instances collected by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 50, for the *acc. c. inf.* after *cupere*, see Thes. l. L. IV: 1433, 38/57. The use of a perfect infinitive after *cupere* is poetical (Thes., l. 7/13). — *credo* is put in parentheses as in 25, 6; 33, 3; 35, 4; 44, 1; 50, 4. — *quia vivum*: for the ellipsis, cf. *apol.* 50, 10: *o gloriam licitam, quia humanam*; *ib.* 17, 5

(Fuld.) and 30, 4; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 70; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 59. 143; Waltz., *Ét.*, 222. 396.

4. *Aspice*: see comm. on § 1. — *monstrosiores*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 3, 13 (396, 26 seqq.): *praestruxit enim fidem incredibili rei rationem edendo, quod in signum esset futura: 'propterea', inquit, 'dabit vobis dominus signum (signo Kroym.): 'ecce virgo concipiet in utero et pariet filium'. Signum autem a deo, nisi novitas aliqua monstruosa, iam signum non fuisset.* — *pro eversione naturae*: *adv. Praex.* 10 (241, 26/7): *nam et sterilem parere contra naturam difficile deo non fuit, sicut nec virginem; in iei.* 7 (283, 6) Tert. calls the fact that Anna became fruitful *naturae mutationem*. *Eversio* is frequently used by Tert. with the following significations: 1) 'subversion', e. g. *apol.* 8, 7; 2) 'total alteration', e. g. *mon.* 11 and the present passage; 3) 'destruction', e. g. 35, 1; 53, 2/3; *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (523, 18): *ignem eversionis*; 4) 'weakening', e. g. *praescr.* 16, 13. — *ut altera . . . stupida, altera intacta*: it is not necessary to follow Reifferscheid in writing *altera ut*. According to Baehrens (*Beitr.*, 311), we must understand *ita* before the second *altera*. This interpretation is certainly possible, cf. *apol.* 11, 13: *atquin ut homines illos fuisse non potestis negare, (sc. ita) etiam*, etc. (see Waltz., *Ét.*, 193); for more instances, see Baehrens, *loc. cit.* (the greater part is highly questionable) and Carlsson, 72, for *ut . . . et = ut . . . ita et*, Dahlmann's note on Varro *l. l.* 8, 36. We may, however, also suppose that *ut* has a causal sense here, and mentally supply the partic. οὔσα (see comm. on 5, 4, and for *ut* attached to a partic. in Tert., Hoppe, *Synt.*, 58): ὥς ἡ μὲν στεῖρα, ἡ δ' ἄθικτος οὔσα. — *seminis stupida* (B) must be the correct reading, though *stupidus* is always used in an absolute sense, except in this passage and in Solin. 17, 9: *stupidos in obtutum* (I owe this information to the editors of the *Thes. l. l.*). At first sight the conjecture by Junius *semini stupida* seems to be right: 'not reacting upon the sperm' (in Ter. *Hec. prol.* 4: *populus studio stupidus*, *studio* is a causal ablat.; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 443; Bennet, *Synt.*, 2, 316 compares Pacuv. 54: (civitas) *studio obstupida*). Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 3, 87), who supposes Junius to be right, compares such passages as *scorp.* 10 (169, 15/7): *dum hic ordo . . . salvus sit suae fidei (sua e fide Reiff.)*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (488, 5/6): *haec Marcion deleat, dum sensui salva sint*; *an.* 17, 6: *extra aquam integer visui remus*; *apol.* 47, 6: *deum . . . neminem rebus humanis*. Still it seems preferable to retain *seminis* and to explain it as an objective genit. This genit. is very frequently used after adjectives which, like *stupidus*, have a negative meaning (for *intrepidus* and *immetuens*, see Konjetzny, 312); from Tert. cf. 10, 5: *culices, ne in tenebris quidem aurium caeci* (see comm.) and *adv. Marc.* 2, 8 (345, 12): *homini . . . infirmo (i. e. impotenti) dominandi*. In the same way we may consider *seminis stupidus* to be equivalent to *seminis stupens* (*stupidus = stupens* e. g. Iuvenc. 4, 89), i. e. *seminis non sentiens* or *non audiens* (for this use of *non audire*, cf. Chiron 851 and Grevander, *Eran.* 25 (1927), 97/100; a remarkable parallel is furnished by Hdt. 3, 29: τοιοῦτοι θεοὶ γίνονται, ἐναίμοι τε καὶ σαρκώδεις καὶ ἐπατόντες σιδηρίων; for *pall.* 2, 4: *et solum*

audiebat, see Gerlo, *Rev. Belge* 18 (1939), 359). We may also refer to the use of an object. genit. after *mutus* (e. g. Cic. *pro Flacco* 6: *muta est huius temporis accusatio*, i. e. 'acc. hoc tempus non memorat') and *surdus* (e. g. Sil. *Pun.* 10, 553: *votorum haud surde meorum*; *ib.* 1, 692; Colum. 3, 10, 8; from the Greek cf. Antiphanes in Athenaeus 10, 450 F: κωφὴν δ' ἀκοῆς αἰσθησιν ἔχουσιν; Bailly in his lexicon quotes Hippocrates 12, 1, 30 (?): κωφός τῶν λεγομένων). This interpretation is supported by the fact that *intactus*, which must also be connected with *seminis*, is followed by an objective genit. in Prud. *apoth.* 568: *intactam thalami . . . puellam*. It is even possible that the genit. depending on *intacta* has caused the connection of *stupida* with a genit., cf. e. g. Hor. *sat.* 1, 1, 35: *haud ignara ac non incauta futuri* (for Verg. *georg.* 3, 498: *infelix studiorum atque immemor herbae*, cf. Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 384); from Tert. cf. *res.* 32 (71, 12): *divinae potius sapientiae religiosus quam suae libidinosus*. Perhaps we must also take into account the analogous use of *sterilis* (for which see von Geisau, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 36 (1916), 247). As to the meaning of *stupidus* in this context, cf. Venant. Fort. *carm.* 3, 12, 39: *stupidi colles* i. e. 'qui culturam non sentiunt' (Forcellini); Ennod. *carm.* 1, 19, 11/2: (Maria) *conceptit aure filium/stupente factum corpore*; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 89 (P. L. 52, 452 B): *in Zacharia et Elisabeth stupet sexus*; *Anthol. Lat.* 148, 8: *fututor hebes*. — *si forte*: 'if that were possible indeed'. Just as in 8, 5, Tert. is reluctant to admit this possibility even for an exceptional case. — *fuerant . . . concepti* instead of *erant concepti*: see Kühn.-St., 1, 164/5; Hofm., *Synt.*, 562; Ch. Müller, 44; Konjetzny, 337. — *glorificat*: a 'direct Christianity' (δοξάζω); see Mohrm., *Aug.*, 183 and 256; Matzkow, 47 *seqq.*; Peterson, Εἰς Θεός, 176 and 318. — *spiritus*: Luc. 1, 15: *spiritu sancto replebitur adhuc ex utero matris suae* (sc. Johannes). The author of [Justin] *Quaest. et respons. ad orthod.*, resp. 13, regards τὰ τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς μητρός τῆς ἀγαλλιάσεως σκιρτήματα as an argument for his conviction that embryos are living beings, and hence will take part in the resurrection of the flesh; as to Christ, cf. Aug. *de trin.* 15, 26, 46: *Nec sane tunc unctus est Christus spiritu sancto, quando super eum baptizatum velut columba descendit . . . sed ista mystica et invisibili unctione tunc intelligendus est unctus, quando verbum dei caro factum est, id est, quando humana natura sine ullis praecedentibus bonorum operum meritis deo verbo est in utero virginis copulata, ut cum illo fieret una persona. Ob hoc eum confitemur natum de spiritu sancto et virgine Maria.*

5. Jerem. 1, 5 is also connected by Ambrosiast. *in Gal.* 1, 15/6 with Christ's *praescientia in utero matris*. — *ex primordii forma*: see comm. on 9, 7. — *et afflat*, sc. *in utero*. — *priusquam*, which in this paragraph occurs twice in quotations from Holy Scripture, is avoided by Tert. in his own writings (*antequam* or *ante . . . quam* is found in *ad nat.* 1, 7, 31; 2, 12, 6; *bapt.* 12, 9; *paen.* 6, 24, etc.), whereas it is preferred by archaists (Hofm., *Synt.*, 735; Tidn., *Did.*, 161₂). — *sanctificavi*: another 'direct Christianity'

(see Matzkow, 35 *seqq.*). — *Utique nequaquam*: cf. e. g. *pub.* 19 (263, 23): *nullo pacto*!

27. *The simultaneous origin of body and soul.*

“Body and soul come into existence simultaneously (§ 1): as they are separated at the same moment through death, so they are united at the same moment through life < ; hence they come to life simultaneously > (§ 2). Now we acknowledge life to exist from the moment of conception, because we declare the soul, whose origin is the beginning of life, to come into existence at that moment; so we conclude that body and soul are united and come to life simultaneously < , viz. at the moment of conception > (§ 3). A reference to the act of procreation (which reference contains nothing shameful) is sufficient to prove this (§ 4), for at the moment of procreation body and soul act simultaneously. — The sperm of the father consists of a corporeal substance, viz. the *humor*, and a psychic one, viz. the *calor* (§ 5). Moreover, in sexual intercourse one feels that from the soul, too, something is detached (§ 6). — The correctness of this view is proved by the prototype of procreation as given in Genesis: at the creation of Adam, the loam from which his body was moulded was the prototype of the liquid substance of the sperm, and the breath of God, from which his soul arose, the prototype of the *calor* which is the psychic part of the sperm (§ 7). In the same way that the loam and the breath of God were united and constituted Adam, the two elements of the sperm constitute man (§ 8). Hence eventually all souls arose from the soul of Adam (§ 9)”.

Before we proceed to an analysis of the contents of this chapter, we must first discuss Tert.’s view about the origin of the embryo in general, especially so, because this subject was not dealt with in the monograph by K. Emmel (*Das Fortleben der antiken Lehren von der Beseelung bei den Kirchenvätern* (Borna-Leipsic 1918); see for this chapter pp. 33/44).

According to Tert., the human body comes into existence by the sperm of the father solidifying the *καταμήνια* of the mother. The clearest account of this view is found in *c. Chr.* 19, 21/3: *materiam seminis, quam constat sanguinis esse calorem (colorem T, ‘col-atum um’ >orem fort.’ Kroym.), ut despumatione mutatum in coagulum sanguinis feminae; ib. 4, 5: humoris et sanguinis foeda coagula* (Kroymann’s punctuation is wrong); *ib. 16, 35 seqq.; adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (491, 1/2): *lege substantiae corporalis ex sanguine et humore; apol.* 9, 8: *in utero, dum adhuc sanguis in hominem delibatur*. This view, in Tert.’s time a very common one, eventually harks back to Aristotle, who asserted that the sperm of the father furnishes the ‘moulding force’ (εἶδος), the *καταμήνια* of the mother the matter (ύλη; cf. e. g. P. van Schilf-gaarde, *De zielkunde van Aristoteles* (Leyden 1938), 73): thus the soul of the embryo comes from the father, its body from the mother, *de generat. animal.* 2, 3 (737a 27 *seqq.*): τὸ γὰρ θῆλυ ὥσπερ ἄρρεν ἐστὶ πεπηρωμένον, καὶ τὰ καταμήνια σπέρμα, οὐ καθαρὸν δέ. ἐν γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει

μόνον, τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρχὴν . καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὅσοις ὑπηνέμια γίνεται τῶν ζώων, ἀμφοτέρων ἔχει τὰ μέρη τὸ συνιστάμενον ὥν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἔχει, διὸ οὐ γίνεται ἔμψυχον· ταύτην γὰρ τὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἐπιφέρει σπέρμα; *ib.* 2, 4 (739b 20/6); for further passages, see Emmel, 75/7.

This view of Aristotle's was borrowed by Athenaeus, the founder of the so-called pneumatic school of physicians; cf. e. g. Galen. *de semine* 2, 2 (IV 612, 3 *seqq.* Kühn): καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ὁ Ἀθήναιος ὡσαύτως Ἀριστοτέλει τὴν μὲν ὕλην τῆς τοῦ ζώου γενέσεως ἐν τῷ καταμηνίῳ τίθεται, τὴν κινουσαν δὲ αὐτὸ δύναμιν ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἄρρενος σπέρματι (cf. Wellmann, *D. pneum. Schule*, 148/50). In general this doctrine of the formation of the embryo from the sperm of the father and the blood of the καταμήνια continued to exist for a long time (though the original theory that these two ingredients are to each other as form is to matter, was soon forgotten; cf. e. g. Marc. Aurel. 5, 4; Plotin. 2, 9, 12). Among the Romans it seems to have been introduced by Varro; cf. the account occurring in Lactant. *opif. dei* 12, 6: *conceptum igitur Varro et Aristoteles sic fieri arbitrantur. Aiunt non tantum maribus inesse semen, verum etiam feminis, et inde plerumque matribus similes procreari; sed earum semen sanguinem esse purgatum* (also cf. *l. l.* 5, 61: *mas ignis, quod ibi semen, aqua femina, quod fetus ab eius humore*; Gell. 3, 10, 7; Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 198); further e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 7, 66: *quando haec est generando homini materia, germine e maribus coaguli modo hoc* (sc. virus menstruum) *in sese glomerante, quod deinde tempore ipso animatur corporaturque*. Among Judaic authors of the Hellenistic period the same view is found, e. g. Sap. Salom. 7, 1/2: ἐν κοιλίᾳ μητρὸς ἐγλύφην σὰρξ . . . παγείς ἐν αἵματι ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρός; Enoch 15, 4 (see Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 362; P. Heinisch, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Münster i. W. 1912), 127); Philo *de opif. mundi* 132: λέγεται γὰρ οὖν καὶ ταῦτα (sc. τὰ καταμήνια) πρὸς ἀνδρῶν φυσικῶν οὐσία σπερματικὴ βρεφῶν εἶναι. The γέννησις ἐξ αἱμάτων mentioned in Ioh. 1, 13 is also to be explained in this way (Rüsche, 362/3). Doxography, which certainly has contributed much to the propagation of this theory, also restricts itself to the mention of its physiological part, e. g. Aët. 5, 6: Πῶς αἱ συλλήψεις γίνονται . Ἀριστοτέλης τὰς μὲν συλλήψεις γίνεσθαι προανελχομένης μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς καθάρσεως τῆς μήτρας, τῶν δὲ καταμηνίων συνεπισπωμένων ἀπὸ τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου μέρος τι τοῦ καθαροῦ αἵματος, ᾧ συμβαίνει τὸν τοῦ ἄρρενος γόνον. In this form it occurs frequently among Christian authors, e. g. Clem. Alex. *paedag.* 1, 6, 48, 1: καὶ δὴ καὶ ἡ διαμόρφωσις τοῦ συλληφθέντος τῷ τῆς ἐπὶ μῆνα καθάρσεως ὑπολελειμμένῳ καθαρῷ περιτώματι κिरναμένου τοῦ σπέρματος γίνεται; Hippolyt. *refut.* 6, 9, 2: γέννημα γυναικὸς, ἐξ αἱμάτων καὶ ἐπιθυμίας σαρκικῆς; [Clem.] *recogn.* 3, 4; Hier. *in Ephes.* 5, 30: *nos enim ex humano semine coagulatur; in Galat.* 4, 19: *deinde per novem menses restricto sanguine futurus homo coagulatur, corporatur, pascitur atque distinguitur*; Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 18, 32: *confessus est se ex semine viri in sanguine coagulatum*; *ib.* 10, 17, 31; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, 50 (445, 4 Souter): *semine admixto sanguinem coagulare et generare*; Prudent. *apotheos.* 105: (Christus) *puellari conceptus sanguine*; Carm. *adv. Marcionit.* 4, 177:

(virgo) *genuit quae sanguine corpus*; Mar. Victorin. *de phys.* 17: *super-ventu spiritus, virtute altissimi, coagulatur natura*. In the middle ages too it is often found, especially after the revival of Aristotelism.

This much may be said about the view held by Tert. in his other writings, which view certainly was not handed down to him by Soranus, as we find it already in the *Apologeticum*. In the present chapter a different opinion is found. The sperm of the male consists of a 'corporeal' and a 'psychic' element: the corporeal ingredient has proceeded from the whole body and is moist, the psychic one comes *ex animae destillatione* and is a hot, aerial essence, just like the soul itself; cf. § 5: *semen totius hominis habens ex corporali substantia humorem, ex animali calorem* (in § 7 the latter element is defined as *vapor*, which of course is equivalent to πνεῦμα). This is the Stoic doctrine, cf. e. g. *St. V. F.* 1, 128: τὸ δὲ σπέρμα φησὶν ὁ Ζήνων εἶναι, ὃ μεθίτησιν ἄνθρωπος, πνεῦμα μεθ' ὑγροῦ, ψυχῆς μέρος καὶ ἀπόσπασμα καὶ τοῦ σπέρματος τοῦ τῶν προγόνων κέρασμα καὶ μῖγμα τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μερῶν συνεληλυθός· ἔχον γὰρ τοὺς λόγους τῷ ὅλῳ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῦτο, ὅταν ἀφεθῇ εἰς τὴν μήτραν, συλληφθὲν ὑπ' ἄλλου πνεύματος, μέρους ψυχῆς τῆς τοῦ θήλεος, καὶ συμφυῆς γενόμενον κρυφθὲν τε φύει (*ib.* more definitions are to be found, which for the greater part are almost identical; cf. also 2, 741 *seqq.*; the passage which we have adduced (Euseb. *praep. evang.* 15, 20, 1) is particularly important, because it was taken from the Ἐπιτομή of Arius Didymus, a work not consulted by Soranus; see the Introduction, pp. 38*/40*). Concerning the further development of the embryo according to the Stoic view, the clearest information is given by Philo *de opif. mundi* 67 (*St. V. F.* 2, 745): Τὸ σπέρμα τῶν ζώων γενέσεως ἀρχὴν εἶναι συμβέβηκε. Τοῦτο ὡς ἔστι φαυλότατον, εἰκοὺς ἀφρῶ θεωρεῖται· ἀλλ' ὅταν εἰς τὴν μήτραν καταβληθὲν ἐνστηρίξη, κίνησιν εὐθὺς λαβὼν εἰς φύσιν τρέπεται. Φύσις δὲ βελτίων σπέρματος, ἐπεὶ καὶ κίνησις ἡρεμίας ἐν γενητοῖς. Ἡ δὲ οἷα τεχνίτης ἢ κυριώτερον εἰπεῖν ἀνεπίληπτος τέχνη ζωοπλαστεῖ τὴν μὲν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν εἰς τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη καὶ μέρη διανέμουσα, τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν εἰς τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις, τὴν τε θρεπτικὴν καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν. To this we must add frag. 743 (Galen *de foet. format.* 6): δοκεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Στωικοῖς) ὁ τεχνίτης αὐτὸς εἶναι τὸ σπέρμα, τισὶ μὲν ὅλον, ἐνίοις δὲ τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα. On the ground of these fragments we may summarize the Stoic doctrine in the following way. The sperm of the male consists of 'moisture' (ὑγρόν) and 'pneuma'. In the uterus this 'pneuma' combines with the 'pneuma' of the woman, which is μέρος ψυχῆς τῆς τοῦ θήλεος; so the soul of the embryo springs from the souls of both parents. The φύσις, i. e. the combination of the two πνεύματα, moulds the body of the child from the ὑγρὴ οὐσία of the sperm of the father; it is present itself in the embryo as 'the soul of a plant', which at the moment of birth changes into a ψυχὴ in consequence of its contact with the cold air (for this question and for the view of Hierocles, see the note on 25, 2). Women produce no sperm, so the body of the embryo, in contrast with its soul, owes its existence to the father only; cf. Aët. 5, 5, 2 (*St. V. F.* 1, frag. 129): Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Ζήνων (τὰς θηλείας) ὕλην μὲν ὑγρὰν προτεσθαι,

οἶονεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς συγγυμνασίας ἰδρῶτας, οὐ μὴν σπέρμα πεπτικόν (= [Galen] *hist. philos.* 109 = *D D G* 640, 24/5); Censorin. *de die nat.* 5, 4: *illud quoque ambiguum facit inter auctores opinionem utrumne ex patris tantummodo semine partus nascatur, ut Diogenes et Hippon Stoicique scripserunt*, etc.; for Sphaerus, cf. *Diog. Laërt.* 7, 159 (*St. V. F.* 1, frag. 129): τὸ δὲ τῆς θηλείας (viz. σπέρμα) ἄγονον ἀποφαίνονται ἄτονόν τε γὰρ εἶναι καὶ ὀλίγον καὶ ὕδατῶδες, ὡς ὁ Σφαῖρος φησιν; note also that, according to *St. V. F.* 1, frag. 128, the male has a πνεῦμα μεθ' ὕγροῦ, the female a πνεῦμα only (the contrary assertion found in *Aët.* 5, 11, 4 is due to an error; see Diels *ad loc.*). Probably the Stoics, just as the adherents of the 'pneumatic' school of physicians (who frequently adopted their views; cf. Galen. IV, 603 Kühn; Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 150), assumed that the mother only furnishes nourishment to the body of the child; perhaps we may find a support for this supposition in *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 746 (*Orig. in evang. Ioh.* 20, 2): τὸ δὲ τέκνον, μεταβαλόντος τοῦ σπέρματος (viz. into the φύσις) καὶ ἐργασαμένου τὴν παρακειμένην αὐτῷ ὕλην (i. e. the ὑγρὴ οὐσία of the sperm of the father), ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν ἐπισυναγόμενων τροφῶν μορφωθὲν καὶ εἰς γένεσιν εὐτρεπισθὲν ὑφίσταται.

The comparatively few statements on this subject found in the remnants of Soranus' work recall the Stoic view, especially the form given to it by Hierocles. At any rate, Soranus assumed a trichotomy σπέρμα-φύσις-ψυχή: when discussing his definition of σύλληψις as κράτησις ἐπίμονος σπέρματος ἢ ἐμβρύου ἢ ἐμβρύων ἢ ἐν ὑστέρᾳ διὰ φυσικὴν αἰτίαν (*gyn.* 1, 43, 1) he writes in support of the distinction between σπέρμα and ἔμβρυον (*ib.* § 3): ὅτι . . . μετὰ . . . τοὺς πρώτους χρόνους, τετυπωμένον τοῦ κατὰ γαστρός καὶ μηκέτι ὄντος τοῦ σπέρματος, οὐ παύεται μὲν οὐσα σύλληψις, ἔστι δὲ οὐ σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐμβρύου· μεταβέβληται μὲν γὰρ ἤδη τὸ σπέρμα καὶ φύσις ἐστί, κατὰ προκοπὴν δὲ καὶ ψυχὴ, καὶ οὐκέτι σπέρμα. This sufficiently shows that Soranus called the fruit σπέρμα as long as the moulding was not perfected (he, too, may have regarded this moulding as being achieved by the 'pneuma' contained in the sperm), and after this assumed a stage denoted by φύσις, which in course of time (κατὰ προκοπὴν) developed into the ψυχή. According to Emmel, who rightly associated this statement with the view of Hierocles (*op. cit.*, 28), the words κατὰ προκοπὴν do not admit of an exact interpretation; however, Muscio 2, 13, 47 writes: *est . . . aborsus ut secundo vel tertio mense iam formatum sed sine anima et gracile pecus emittat* (viz. *matrix*; for further particulars concerning this passage, see the note on 37, 2), so that we may conclude that Soranus also assumed the existence of a *pecus cum anima* (ἔμβρυον ἔμψυχον), and so regarded the development of the φύσις into the ψυχή as taking place before birth (cf. the view of Hierocles). Moreover, we may be certain that he considered the body of the embryo to have sprung from the sperm of the father only. Firstly, he frequently says that the woman does not contribute any sperm to the ζωογονία (e. g. *gyn.* 1, 12, 2: δοκεῖ τὸ τοῦ θήλεος σπέρμα πρὸς ζωογονίαν μὴ συλλαμβάνεσθαι τῷ εἰς τὸ ἐκτὸς ἐκχεῖσθαι);

secondly, he points out (*ib.* 1, 33, 1) that she δεκτικόν ἐστὶ σπερμάτων καὶ συλληπτικὸν εἰς ὑπόστασιν τοῦ ζῴου: so the uterus is no more than a depository for the sperm of the male. This interpretation is in perfect accordance with the fact that he frequently compares the act of procreation to the sowing of a field: when the condition of the mother influences that of the child, we most compare this with the influence exerted by the soil on the plants (*ib.* 1, 35, 6: καθάπερ γὰρ οὐδὲ λυπρὸν χωρίον τελειοῖ σπέρματα καὶ φυτά, τῇ δὲ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ κακία καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς τῶν φυτῶν τε καὶ σπερμάτων ἀπόλλυσιν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ σώματα τὰ τῶν θηλειῶν παρὰ φύσιν διακείμενα οὐ κρατεῖ τῶν μεθιεμένων εἰς αὐτὰ σπερμάτων, ἀλλὰ τῇ παρ' ἑαυτῶν κακίᾳ συννοσεῖν ἢ καὶ ἀπόλλυσθαι ταῦτα ἀναγκάζει; see also 1, 36, 1; 1, 39, 3; 1, 40, 3; 1, 53, 1, etc.).

Tert.'s statements agree with the view of Soranus: the sperm of the father contains all that is necessary for the creation of man, and is kept *sulco et arvo suo* (§ 8; cf. also 19, 6: *genitalibus feminae foveis*), so that a human being comes into existence *ex utraque substantia* (both furnished by the father). This theory is still more elucidated by the *exemplum primordii*. Adam is the *fons naturae* and *generis princeps* (20,6), from whom the *redundantia animarum* has sprung; thus all men consist of substances which were present in him. These substances, *limus* and *flatus* (dei), are also the prototypes of the *humor* and *calor* which constitute the sperm of the male, so that the conclusion is obvious that all human beings owe their entire existence to this sperm. Hence we are obliged to assume that Tert. (probably in accordance with Soranus) rejects the Stoic view that the 'pneuma' contained in the sperm combines with a 'pneuma' present in the uterus. As for the resemblance of children to their mothers (Tert. twice refers to the resemblance of children to their parents: 5, 4 and 25, 9), we need not regard this as contrary to Tert.'s other statements, as does Emmel (p. 39); the Stoics already emphasized the influence of the nourishment furnished by the mother; the comparison to the seed which is entrusted to the field points the same way.

Thus, by following Soranus, Tert. lost sight of his former view that, through the *καταμήνια*, the woman furnishes all the matter for the procreation of the embryo. It is very remarkable that this view is not only found in the *Apologeticum*, but also in the treatise *De carne Christi*, which is contemporary or posterior to *De anima*: the theory of Soranus has not been able to supersede Tert.'s former opinion. Perhaps he did not even consider that a γέννησις ἐξ αἱμάτων is incompatible with the idea that the uterus is no more than a 'depository'.

We may now proceed to the analysis of the present chapter. Tert. wishes to demonstrate in the first place that body and soul come into existence simultaneously, viz. at the moment of conception. The reason why he wishes to do so, is evident: if the soul is prior to the body, this may come an argument in favour of the doctrine of metempsychosis, which in its turn endangers the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh (see the comm. on ch. 33); if, on the other

hand, the body is prior to the soul, so that the soul does not enter the body before the moment of birth, the embryo is not an animate being, which is in contradiction with the Christian view that the child in the womb is a ζῷον (see the note on 37, 2). The argument consists of three parts: a syllogism (§§ 2/3), an '*argumentum ex sensu communi*' (§§ 4/6: a reference to the act of procreation), and finally (as usual; see the Introduction, pp. 15*/20*), an '*argumentum ex scriptura sacra*' (§§ 7/9). Of these the syllogism only (for which see the paraphrase, p. 342) requires a closer examination. It would have been sufficient to say, as was demonstrated in ch. 25, that the soul exists from the moment of conception, which, of course, also applies to the body, so that body and soul come into existence simultaneously. Probably Tert. regarded this argument as too succinct; at any rate, he starts from the contrast between life and death. The argument in § 2 contains a sophism, the term 'life' being used in two senses: 1) human life, = *coniunctio corporis animaeque*; 2) the life of body and soul separately. Thus Tert. argues that body and soul come into existence ('come to life') at the very moment that their being joined originates the life of the human being, and overlooks the fact that this argument does not preclude a previous existence of the soul. The addition in § 3 serves to prove that the simultaneous genesis of body and soul takes place at the moment of conception; it may be paraphrased in this way: 'A (from § 2). *Vita pariter* ('simultaneously') *corpori et animae obvenit*. B. *Vitam a conceptu agnoscimus (nam exinde vita, quo anima, et animam a conceptu vindicamus)*. C. *Ergo vita pariter* <, i. e. *in conceptu*, > *corpori et animae obvenit*'. Here the point at issue (the moment at which the soul comes into existence) is contained in the premiss, and the conclusion (which only repeats the conclusion of § 2) omits the most important words, viz. *in conceptu*. The only possible argument would have been: "life exists from the moment that both body and soul exist; according to the former syllogism, these substances come into existence simultaneously, and the body comes into existence at the moment of conception; so we conclude that both life and soul come into existence at that very moment".

The simultaneous genesis of body and soul was also assumed by Irenaeus (Syrian frag. 26 = 2, 455 Harvey; no proof is furnished) and Gregor. Nyss., *de hom. opif.* 28/9 (P. G. 44, 233 B *seqq.*). It is highly probable that the adherents of creatianism, who frequently point out that the embryo is an animate being (cf. e. g. Lactant. *de opif. dei* 17, 7, who calls the embryo *animal*; see the note on 26, 5 for the use made of Jerem. 1, 5 in this context), also shared this view of the supporters of traducianism, though no conclusive statements on this subject are found. It stands to reason that they do not refer to the hereditary transmission of mental qualities (cf. e. g. Lact. *de opif. dei* 19, 3/4, especially these words: *nam terreni parentis nihil est, nisi ut humorem corporis, in quo est materia nascendi, cum sensu voluptatis emittat vel recipiat*).

Finally, *res.* 45 (91, 23 *seqq.*) must be mentioned, in which passage Tert. admits that some time elapsed between the creation of Adam's

body and his receiving a soul, but adds the remark: *omnis . . . consummatio atque perfectio* (in this case the *animatio*), *etsi ordine postumat, effectu anticipat*, and from the present chapter concludes that in spite of this Adam's body and soul were created simultaneously.

1. **animal:** τὸ ζῷον; cf. 1, 2 and 25, 5. — **conflata:** the choice of this verb may be due to the definition of the soul as *flatus dei*. — **et concipi et confici, perfici:** since the two compounds of *facere* are very closely connected, the asyndeton must not be neutralized by the insertion of *et*. A great number of similar cases (mostly changed by editors) has been collected by Löfstedt, *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 29/33. The point at issue here is always that of three conceptions two are more closely connected; these are either put at the end, as in the present passage, or at the beginning, in which case they are connected by *et*, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 15 (466, 20): *gloriam et honorem, sublimitatem*. For literature on this subject, see Mnemos., III ser. 10 (1942), 236/7, where I have defended the reading of the Cod. Mediceus: *ripas et colles, montium edita* in *Tac. ann.* 12, 56, 3 (the editors write *montiumque* or *ac montium*); cf. also A. Erikson, *Epiphan.*, 80/1. To the passages collected by Löfstedt we may perhaps add *apol.* 46, 18 (Fuld.): *famae negotiator et salutis, vitae* (Thörnelli, *St. Tert.*, 4, 35₄ and Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 53, dare not take a decision; according to Löfst., *Apol.*, 65 and Waltzing, *Ét.*, 67, *salutis* (which is not found in the *Vulg.*) is an interpolation). The following passages too are worth mentioning: *Arnob.* 2, 23: *non bovis ritu aut asini, porci*; *Mar. Victorin. hymn.* 3: *libera nos et salva nos, iustifica nos, o beata trinitas*; an 'Ambrosian' hymn: *Deus, tuorum militum/sors et corona, praemium*; [*Caes.*] *bell. Alex.* 1, 1: *t tormenta undique conquiri et frumentum mitti, auxilium adduci iubet*. As instances of the second form, where the two first members of the tricolon are more closely connected, we may adduce: *Liv.* 26, 12, 14: *rem bene gestam coeundo conferundoque cum hoste castra, fortunam tentando*; *ib.* 24, 1, 7/8; *Tac. ann.* 4, 6, 3: *frumenta et pecuniae vectigales, cetera publicorum fructuum*; *Tert. adv. Val.* 4 (181, 8/9): *sensus et affectus, motus (et motus Rīg. Kroym.)*; *Tert.* often connects *sensus* and *affectus*, e. g. 32, 5). To the latter group we may join those *tricola* where the two first members belong together, but are not connected by *et*, e. g. *Plaut. Pseudol.* 70: *distractio discidium, vastities venit*; *Ter. Eun.* 242: *qui color nitor, vestitus* (see Lindholm, 38₁), to the former such cases as *spect.* 3 (5, 1): *non ibis in circum, non in theatrum, agonem*. For the use of an asyndeton at the end of a polysyndeton, see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 72; e. g. *ad nat.* 2, 5, 17: *ipsa observatione condicionum suarum et fide operum et instantia <curriculorum> et cura demutationum, memoria reciprocationum*; cf. the old Latin translation of Clem. *ad Corinth.* 61, 1: *salutem et pacem et concordiam, tranquillitatem (et tr. Wölfflin, A. L. L. 9, 94; the Greek text has ὑγιαίναν, εἰρήνην, ὁμόνοιαν, εὐστραθείαν)*; for *Amm. Marc.*, cf. Blomgren, *Amm.*, 6/7; for the quotation of *Exod.* 23, 21 in *adv. Marc.* 3, 16 (403, 12), see Quispel, 67.

2. For the contents of this and the next paragraph, see the

preface to this chapter. — **disiunctio corporis animaeque**: cf. 52, 1; 57, 2: (animas) *etiam proba morte disiunctas*.

3. **quia animam a conceptu vindicamus**: this had been argued at the end of ch. 25, but no proof had been furnished, because in that chapter Tert. only combated the view that the embryo is not a ζῷον; the argument follows in §§ 4/7 of this chapter. — **exinde . . . quo** also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 2, 3 (336, 26/7): (bonitatem) *quasi exinde censendam, quo coepit operari*; *ib.* 2, 12 (352, 6/7); 5, 8 (598, 13); for *exinde . . . ex quo*, cf. Löfst., *Krit.*, 95; *exinde quod*: *adv. Marc.* 3, 12 (395, 16); '*exinde quo fort.*' Kroym.); *adv. Iud.* 13, 13 (*quod P N*; *quo T Kroym.*); *paen.* 6, 17; cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 98. *ex eo quo* occurs in *Acta Archel.* 20, 1 and [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 65, *quo* = *ex quo*, not preceded by *exinde* or *ex eo*, in Cypr. Gall. *Exod.* 368: *temporis, quo* (= *ex quo*) *venit*; cf. Svénn., *Pallad.*, 642. — **in vitam compinguntur**: cf. 25, 2 and 42, 2. — **Tunc si**: cf. 9.4. — **primatum** seems to have the sense here of 'right of primogeniture', as in Cypr. *ep.* 73, 25 and Aug. *civ. dei* 16, 37 (*Vulg. Gen.* 25, 31: *primogenita*). *Secundatus* is á. λ., just as *prioratus* in *adv. Val.* 4 (181, 2).

4. Note the varying of the expressions: *dividentur . . . diversae . . . distantia* (see 10, 9); cf. § 8 *duo diversa atque divisa. Contemporales*: Tp. *eiusdemque momenti*: a genit. of quality in conjunction with a compound adjective, as e. g. Petron. 140, 6: *podagricum . . . lumborumque solutorum*; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 398. — **Natura . . . erubescenda** has been copied by Hier. in *ad Galat.* 4, 19. For the use of *erubescere*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 14. — **Coneubitum . . . foedavit**: this sentence is to be regarded as a reminiscence from the confutation of Marcion, who called marriage φθορά καὶ πορνεία (see Harnack, *Marcion*, 273* and 277*/8*); the most important passage is *adv. Marc.* 1, 29 (331, 11/7): *multum differt inter causam et culpam, inter statum et excessum. ita huiusmodi non institutio, sed exorbitatio reprobanda est, secundum censuram institutoris ipsius, cuius est tam: crescite et multiplicamini, quam et: non adulterabis et uxorem proximi tui non concupisces, morte punientis et incestam, sacrilegam atque monstrosam in masculos et in pecudes libidinum insaniam*. In *de monog.* and *de exhort. cast.* Tert.'s view about this subject becomes very different, e. g. *exh. cast.* 9, 20 *seqq.*: *leges videntur matrimonii et stupri differentiam facere . . . non per conditionem rei ipsius*; cf. Bill, 92/4; d'Alès, 460/74; Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, 394/7; Guignebert, 283/4. For *veneranda est*, cf. c. *Chr.* 4, 13/4 (after a description of pregnancy): *hanc venerationem naturae, Marcion, despuis, et quomodo natus es?* For *ne . . . interpretationis* we may quote many similar passages from Christian authors, e. g. Clem. Alex. *paedag.* 2, 10, 92, 3: οὐκ αἰσχρὸν δὲ ἡμῖν ἐπ' ὠφελεία τῶν ἀκούοντων τὰ κυητικὰ ὀνομάζειν ὄργανα, ὧν οὐκ ἐπὶσχύνθη τὴν δημιουργίαν ὁ θεός; *ib.* 2, 4, 52, 2: the αἰδοῖα are the object αἰδοῦς, οὐκ αἰσχύνης; Cyrill. Hieros. *catech.* 12, 26: οὐδὲν μικρόν ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ κατασκευῇ, ἐὰν μὴ μολύνῃ μοιχείᾳ καὶ ἀκολασίᾳ ταύτην; Greg. Nyss. *orat. catech.*

27; Joh. Chrysost. *homil.* 31 in Cor. I, § 1 (*ad* 1 Cor. 12, 21; P. G. 61, 258/9): Τί γάρ τῶν μορίων τῶν γεννητικῶν ἀτιμότερον ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι δοκεῖ; Ἀλλ' ὅμως πλείονος ἀπολαύει τιμῆς καὶ οἱ σφόδρα πένητες καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν γυμνὸν ἔχωσι σῶμα, οὐκ ἂν ἀνάσχοιντο ἐκεῖνα τὰ μέλη δεῖξαι γυμνά . . . Ἀλλ' ἀπόλονται οἱ ἀκόλαστοι, οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ δημιουργήματα διαβάλλοντες; Lactant. *opif. dei* 13, 2; Cassiodor. *de anim.* 9. Aug. *civ. dei* 14, 23 seems to have copied this passage: *quisquis ergo ad has litteras* (sc. coitum Adae et Evae) *impudicus accedit, culpam refugiat, non naturam, facta denotet suae turpitudinis, non verba nostrae necessitatis.* — **crescite**, etc.: a totally different interpretation of Gen. 1, 28 is given in *pud.* 16 (255, 9 *seqq.*), *mon.* 7, and *exh. cast.* 6, 6 *seqq.*; according to these passages, the command to multiply was countermanded by 1 Cor. 7, 29; for *benedictus status*, cf. the equally divergent statement in *pud.* 16 (255, 25/6): *studet* (Paulus) *compescere benedictionis concubitum, ne maledictionis excusetur.*

5. **sollemni**: 'usual', not 'solemn'; similarly, *adv. Marc.* 4, 20 (487, 11/2): *ordinarium et sollemnem menstrui vel partialis sanguinis fluxum*; *res.* 62 (123, 25): *in sollemnibus carnis*. For more passages, cf. J. Schümmer, *D. altchristl. Fastenpraxis*, 537. — **officio**: v. v. 3: *et tamen vim carnis pati minus est, quia de officio naturae venit*; *ad ux.* 2, 3: *officia sexus.* — **conebitu** . . . **communi**: not 'usual' (as might be supposed because *sollemni* precedes), but 'joint'; cf. Apul. *Asclep.* 21 (57, 13/4 Thom.): *ex commixtione communi.* — **et animam** . . . **fungi**: cf. Ambrst. in 1 Cor. 6, 18: *quia in tantum agglutinatur anima corpori, ut in ipso momento nihil aliud cogitare homini liceat aut intendere; quia ipsam mentem captivam subdit ipsa submersio et absorbitio libidinis et concupiscentiae carnalis*; *ib.*: *Fornicari autem corporale delictum est, quod et corpus contingit et animam: non enim sine desiderio carnis, quia habet et caro proprium motum, anima concupiscit, ut peccet in carnem, quamvis sine anima nihil possit.* For *opera*, cf. the note on 10, 8, for *instinctu*, on 16, 1. *Actus* is opposed to *status* in 11, 1 and 53, 3, to *effectus* in 45, 2. *Fungi* is used absolutely, see the note on 9, 8. — **toto homine concusso** is almost an ablat. of result, see the comm. on 19, 5. — **despumatur**: this conjecture by Junius is necessary (*despumatur* in B Gel), cf. *mon.* 3: *ut ne unis quidem nuptiis fervorem carnis despumare permitteret*; Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 33: *post despumatas corporum voluptates*; *ib.* 2, 37: *ad despumandas libidines* (but *ep.* 69, 9, 1: *venter . . . mero aestuans cito despumatur in libidines* and *ep. Pachom.* 7: *malae cogitationes quae . . . despulant in corporis voluptatibus*). The words *despumatur semen* are to be taken literally, as is shown by c. Chr. 19, 21 *seqq.*: *materiam seminis, quam constat sanguinis esse calorem, ut despumatione mutatum in coagulum sanguinis feminae.* In doxographical literature this view is attributed to Pythagoras, cf. Aët. 5, 3, 2: Π. ἀφρὸν τοῦ χρηστοτάτου αἵματος τὸ σπέρμα. It was also held by Aristotle, e. g. *de gener. anim.* 2, 2 (736a 13 *seqq.*): αἷτιον δὲ τῆς λευκότητος τοῦ σπέρματος ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ γονὴ ἀφρός . . . ἔοικε δὲ οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους λαμβάνειν ἀφρώδης ἡ τοῦ σπέρματος οὐσα φύσις; *ib.* 1, 19 (726b 1/13). In *hist. anim.* 3, 3 (512b 12) he mentions Diogenes

of Apollonia as an adherent of this opinion (cf. Diels, *Vorsokr.*, s. v., B 6), which, according to Vindicianus 1, was adopted by Herophilus, Erasistratus, and the Stoics, whereas it was combated by Diocles (cf. M. Wellmann, *Frag. d. gr. Ärzte*, I, 51/2). We may also compare Galen *de usu part.* 14, 9 (IV 183 K.): αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ σπέρμα πνευματώδες ἐστὶ καὶ οἶον ἀφρῶδες; *id.*, *de semine* 1, 5 (IV 531 K.): σὺ (sc. Ἀριστοτέλης φίλτατε) γὰρ εἰς ὁ καλῶς εἰκάσας ἀφρῶ τὸ σπέρμα (of course these words are ironical; in IV 613 he contests the view that the sperm originates in the blood); Philo *de opif. mundi* 67 (influenced by the Stoics); Clem. Alex. *paedeg.* 1, 6, 48 (who mentions Diogenes); Method. *sympos.* 2, 2 and *de lepra* 5, 2; the fragment from Porphyry. Π. ἀγαλμάτων preserved by Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 3, 11 (114 C). — **habens . . . calorem**: as πνεῦμα μεθ' ὕγρῳ (see the preface to this chapter, p. 344). *humor* often means *semen*, e. g. c. Chr. 4, 5; *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (491, 2); Lactant. *opif. dei* 19, 4: *humorem corporis, in quo est materia nascendi*. — **si . . . Graecorum**: Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 35) translates: "wenn die Seele der Griechen dem Namen nach etwas Frostiges ist", and compares 40,2: *servus vel minor amicus, animalia nomina* (however, cf. the note on that passage); a better parallel is furnished by *adv. Herm.* 24 (152, 13 *seqq.*): *quaero ergo, cum materiae nominatio non extet in scriptura, quomodo ei etiam terrena appellatio adcommodetur* (Rhen. Kroym. *terrae*): "the denomination 'earth'"; in the same way we may translate here: "if the soul of the Greeks (= if among the Greeks the soul) is (means) the word 'cold'", εἰ ψυχὴ ψυχρός. Cf. [Cypr.] *de sing. cler.* 26 (203, 2 H.): *matrem cuius mores maternum indicat nomen*; Amm. Marc. 23, 6, 5: *Augusta nuncupatio* "the denomination 'Augustus'"; [Cypr.] *adv. aleat.* 8, 5: *sed ethnicum tibi nomen est*; Arnob. 3, 29: *Saturnium nomen* (*ib.* 4, 16; 6, 7. 10; see Wiman, 49/50). The sentence refers to the discussion occurring in 25, 6/7.

6. **verecundia . . . probatio**: for *periclitari* followed by an ablat. *limitationis*, cf. Quint. *decl. min.* p. 143, 23 Ritter: *periclitator enim nuptiis, periclitator matrimonio* (cf. Wahlén, 172); for Celsus, see Brolén, 19 and Englund, 126. As to the sense, cf. Sen. *controv.* 1, 2, 23: *quaedam satius est causae detrimento tacere quam verecundiae* (sc. dicere); Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 36: *periclitamur responsionis verecundia, et quasi inter duos scopulos et quasdam necessitatis et pudicitiae συμπληγάδας, hinc atque inde vel pudoris vel causae naufragium sustinemus*. — **genitale virus**: similarly, Arnob. 5, 10: *seminis illud nocentissimum virus* (in Plin. *n. h.* 9, 157 and 28, 175 *virus* denotes the semen of animals; *ib.* 7, 65 = *crur menstruus*); in Catull. 80, 8 the sperm is called *serum*, in Prud. *Hamart.* 592 *salivae* (of serpents; *ib.* 589: *genitale venenum*); we may also compare 'Mithrasliturg.' p. 12, 3 Dieterich: ἰχώρος σπερματικοῦ. In Sanskrit *viśthā* ('venom') often means 'semen', cf. Meringer, *Deutsche Lit. Ztg.* 36 (1915), 450/1. — **de anima . . . exire** is of course meant literally, cf. the preface to this chapter. — **devegescimus**: ἄ. λ. — **cum lucis detrimento**: Diocles frag. 141 Wellm.: κακοῦται δὲ μάλιστα τοῦ σώματος τοῖς πλεονάζουσιν (viz. περὶ συνουσίας) ἀκαίρως τὰ περὶ τὴν κύστιν καὶ νεφροὺς καὶ πνεύμονα.

καὶ ὀφθαλμούς καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν νωτιαῖον μυελόν; Clem. Alex. *paedag.* 2, 10, 94, 2: καὶ μὴν καὶ ἀγλὺν περισκεδάννυσσι (ἢ συνουσία) τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις; Aug. *civ. dei* 14, 16: *ut momento ipso temporis, quo ad eius (sc. voluptatis) pervenitur extremum, paene omnis acies . . . obruiatur.* — *destillatio* and *defaecatio* (Tp) are particularly concrete translations of ἀπόσπασμα.

7. *primordii exempla*: see the note on 9, 7 and the preface to this chapter. — *De limo caro in Adam*: an addition to this is furnished by *res.* 7 (34, 25 *seqq.*): *obliteratus igitur et devoratus est limus in carnem. quando? cum factus est homo in animam vivam de dei flatu, vaporeo scilicet et idoneo torrere quodammodo limum in aliam qualitatem, quasi in testam, ita in carnem.* In *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (324, 8/14) the same scriptural text is made use of to prove that only the body deserves to be called *homo*. — *vapor spiritus*: cf. 24, 2; *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 4/5): *intellege itaque adflatum minorem spiritu esse, et si de spiritu accidit, ut aurulam eius, non tamen spiritum* (MR; Kroym. needlessly changes the text); *res.* 7 (quoted in the preceding note): *vaporeo; ib.* (35, 9/10): *caro . . . ex limo per adflatum divini vaporem.*

8. For *divisus* = *diversus*, see the note on 37, 5. — *in uno* instead of *in unum*, cf. 6, 8 and Svénn., *Pallad.*, 276. — *suleo*: cf. the similar use of ἔλοκες Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 1211; Eur. *Phoen.* 18; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 2, 10, 92, 2: τῶν τῆς μήτρας . . . ἀλλάκων; Method. *sympos.* 2, 1, 31 etc.; in Latin e. g. Lucr. 4, 1272; Verg. *Georg.* 3, 135/6; Hier. *in Galat.* 4, 19; *Anthol. Lat.* 712, 17. — *arvo*: this metaphor is a much more common one, cf. P. Groeneboom's note on Aesch. *Sept.* 753/4: ματρὸς ἀγνάν . . . ἄρουραν; A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*³, 47; Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 316; Frazer, *The golden bough*, 2², 205 *seqq.*; K. Latte, B Ph W 45 (1925), 691. For Soranus, see the preface to this chapter. From Latin literature we may adduce Lucr. 4, 1107; Verg., *loc. cit.*; Solin. 1, 51; Ambros. *expos. in ev. Luc.* 1, 44; Aug. *civ. dei* 14, 23. This metaphor occurs very often in the works of Philo (e. g. *de aet. mundi* 69; *de spec. leg.* 3, 33) and Clem. Alex. (e. g. *paedag.* 2, 10, 83, 2. 91, 1. 102, 1). — *effruticent*: this verb only occurs in Tert.'s works (also *ad nat.* 1, 5, 2: *naevus aliqui effruticet*). — *secundum genus*: cf. 20, 1/2. — *condicioni genitali*: it is not certain whether we must read *conditioni* or *condicioni* (A has a lacuna here, and as to orthography B is of no value). Hey, *Thes. l. L. VI*, 2: 1813, 39/41 (s. v. *genitalis*): "Tert. an. 27 *condicioni-i* (i. cuius generanti)", seems to have meant *conditioni* = *creaturae* (for which cf. the note on 9, 8). At all events, we may also interpret *omni condicioni genitali* = *o. c. geniturae* (cf. the note on 43, 8: *testimonio naturali* = *t. naturalitatis*): 'for every procreation'.

9. *animarum redundantia*: cf. the note on 20, 6 and *adv. Marc.* 1, 29 (332, 16): *-am subolis*. — *agitur* (B) would mean *est, extat*, as in *adv. Marc.* 4, 16 (472, 21/3): *dei disciplina, qua cognita . . . convenientia voluntatis et facti ex fide, ut sub metu dei, agitur*; an. 52, 3: *nullum (sc. exitum mortis) ita dicimus lenem, ut non vi agatur.* — *praeafatione . . . unius*:

in the same way Gen. 2, 18 is denoted in *mon.* 4: *in praefatione ipsius operis* (viz., the procreation of Eve, Gen. 2, 21 *seqq.*). — *praesint*: the plural according to LXX: ἀρχέτωσαν (Vulg.: *praesit*). — *Nihil mirum . . . semine*: the interpunction after *mirum* (Reifferscheid) was rightly abolished by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 3, 29₁) who refers to *adv. Marc.* 2, 29 (376, 17): *nec mirum erit diversitas temporalis* and *spect.* 22 (22, 20); cf. also Gerlo 2, 42.

28. *Pythagoras and his doctrine about the transmigration of souls.*

Having finished his discussion of the origin of the soul (ch. 25—27) Tert. returns to Plato's theory of metempsychosis (23, 5/6), which he refutes in ch. 28—35. The first attack is directed against the personality of its originator Pythagoras (in the same way Socrates is attacked in ch. 1 as *princeps philosophorum*).

"According to some authors, Plato's 'ancient tale' about metempsychosis originated with Pythagoras, whereas Albinus contends that it came from a god, perhaps from the Egyptian Mercury; but divine utterances are only to be found in Holy Scripture (§ 1). So the only remaining possibility is that Plato borrowed his theory from Pythagoras. But Pythagoras is said to have owed his wisdom to a descent to Hades (§ 2), which in reality was no more than a trick. The accounts of his various reincarnations are still less worthy of belief (§ 3). Nor is the account of the recognition of the shield of Euphorbus more reliable, for there, too, a fraud was by no means out of the question. We may also reckon with a magic imposture (Pherecydes, Pythagoras' master, was an accomplished magician) or with the activities of a demon who first dwelt in Euphorbus, and afterwards in Pythagoras. If, in spite of this, we regard this account as reliable, it remains inexplicable that Pythagoras recognized none of Euphorbus' partisans".

As is shown in the commentary, the structure of the argument must be ascribed to Tert. himself. He combines a note from the treatise of Albinus (§ 1) with two details of the legend of Pythagoras, which may have been borrowed from the same work (see the note on § 2: *mortem simulat . . . redditus*).

1. *vetus . . . Platonis*: *Phaedo* 70 C: Παλαιὸς μὲν οὖν ἔστι τις λόγος οὗ μεμνήμεθα, etc. This παλαιὸς λόγος is often mentioned, e. g. Plato *leg.* 4, 715 E; [Arist.] *Π. κόσμου* 6; Philo *de plant.* 17 and *de confus. ling.* 184; Albin. *Ἐπιτ.* 28 (181, 31 *seqq.* H.); *Method. de resurr.* 2, 10, 5. According to [Justin] *Cohort. ad gentil.* 25, Plato by using these words signifies in covert terms that he read the books of Moses (though in this paragraph too Moses is mentioned, we are not to suppose that Tert. shares this view, for it is impossible that he regards Moses as the founder of the doctrine of metempsychosis). The words *apud memoriam Platonis* (≈ οὗ μεμνήμεθα) contain a malicious allusion to 24, 11: *Plato scilicet solus . . . idearum et oblitus et recordatus est*. — *quod hinc . . . effici vivos*: instead of many conjectures only one slight alteration is necessary, viz. *habeat* for *habeant*: Tert. gives a

faithful translation of *Phaedo* 70 C: ὡς εἰσὶν ἐνθὲνδε ἀφικόμεναι ἐκεῖ, καὶ πάλιν γε δεῦρο ἀφικνοῦνται καὶ γίγνονται . . . καὶ εἰ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει, πάλιν γίγνεσθαι ἐκ τῶν ἀποθανόντων τοὺς ζῶντας. With this we may compare the translation of *Phaedo* 65 A *seqq.* in 18, 1/2 (which, however, is a little more free) and Cicero's rendering of the famous sentence of Protagoras (*nat. deor.* 1, 63): *de diis neque ut sint neque ut non sint habeo dicere*. — *ita habeat*: as is generally known, an adverb is often attached to *habere* in colloquial Latin (e. g. *Hor. sat.* 1, 9, 53) and in texts translated from the Greek; cf. *Thes. l. L.* VI, 3: 2451, 4 *seqq.* and 2461, 32/2462, 11. In the *Itala* this Grecism is a very common one, e. g. *Act. apost.* 21, 13 (*cod. e*): *mori in Hierusalem parate habeo* (ἐτοίμως ἔχω; *Vulg. paratus sum*); *ib.* 15, 36 (*cod. g*): *quomodo habeant* (πῶς ἔχουσιν; *Vulg. q. se h.*); *Eclus.* 3, 27: *cor durum habebit male* (κακωθήσεται; Hier. did not translate this book himself). Especially *ita* and *sic* are often attached to this verb, also in texts which are not translations, e. g. *Fronto ad Antonin. imp.* 1, 2, 2: *nam ita res habet*; *Theodor. Prisc. eupor.* 3, 5, 14: *quod si forte ita res habet*; *Mar. Victorin. in ep. ad Philipp.* 3, 21: *ista si sic habent*; [*Caesar. Arelat.*] *serm.* 162, 1 *Morin*; *Vict. Vit.* 1, 26: *qualiter quisquam haberet*; *Victorin. Petav. in Apocal., recens. Hieron.*, p. 124, 1 *Haussl.*; *Novat. de trin.* 28 (from this use of *habere* we are to keep separate such cases as *Aug. de cura pro mort. gerenda* 7, 9: *quae scriptura sic habet*, for which cf. *Goelzer, Jér.*, 422); cf. *Draeger, Synt.*, 1, 387/8; *Rönsch, Sem.*, 3, 43/4; *Kaulen*, 180; *Svenn., Pallad.*, 475; *J. Englund*, 86; *Blatt*, 65, 1; *Erikson, Epiphan.*, 57/8; for *male* and *bene habere*, *Svenn., op. cit.*, 596₁, for *necesse habet*, *ib.* 473 (we may add *Chiron* 751, where an *accus. c. inf.* occurs after this expression, just as in the present passage after *ita habeat*; in *Iren.* 2, 1, 1 we find the same construction after *bene habet*). For *Tert.*, cf. the passages collected by *Hoppe, Synt.*, 63, especially *adv. Val.* 14 (193, 2): *dum ita rerum habet* ('οὕτω τῶν πραγμάτων ἔχουσα'); we may add *adv. Herm.* 39 (169, 18/9): *quando quae hodie videntur aliter habeant quam pristina fuerunt* and *de cult. fem.* 1, 3, 2: *hoc si non tam expedite haberet*. — *Albinus*: see the Introduction, pp. 41*/4*. — *Mercurii . . . Aegyptii*: cf. the note on 2, 3. The same combination occurs in *Arnob.* 2, 13: *vos, vos appello qui Mercurium, qui Platonem Pythagoramque sectamini*. — *intonuit* is used in this context in imitation of Holy Scripture (e. g. *Ps.* 17, 14; 28, 3); similarly, *pud.* 12 (241, 25): *intonuit evangelium*; [*Cypr.*] *de duod. abus. saec.* 12 (172, 20 H.); *Hier. in Gal.* 5, 26; *adv. Iovin.* 2, 6; *tract. de Ps.* 96 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 143, 16), etc.; for the qualification of the apostles as *fili i(h)onitruī*, see *H. Koch, Z NT W* 32 (1933), 140. — *Multo . . . annis*: a different calculation is found in the *fragmentum Fuldense*, § 2: *Troiano denique proelio ad mille annos ante est* (sc. *Moyses*); *unde et ipso Saturno. Secundum enim historiam Thalli, qua relatum est Belum Assyriorum et Saturnum Titanorum reges cum Iove dimicasse, ostenditur Belum CCCXX et duobus annis Iliacum exitum antecessisse*. Here *Tert.* follows *Theophil. ad Autolyc.* 3, 29: καὶ γὰρ Βήλου τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεύσαντος καὶ Κρόνου τοῦ Τιτᾶνος Θάλλος μέμνηται, φάσκων τὸν Βῆλον πεπολεμηχέναι σὺν τοῖς Τιτᾶσι πρὸς τὸν

Δία καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ θεοὺς λεγομένους . . . κατὰ γὰρ τὴν Θάλλου ἱστορίαν ὁ Βῆλος προγενέστερος εὐρίσκεται τοῦ Ἰλιακοῦ πολέμου ἔτεσι τιβ' (= 322). ὅτι δὲ πρὸς που ἔτεσι ἑνακοσίους ἢ καὶ χιλίους προάγει ὁ Μωσῆς τῆς τοῦ Ἰλίου ἀλώσεως, ἐν τοῖς ἐπὶ νῶν δεδηλώκαμεν (this passage has also been used by Lactant., *div. instit.* 1, 23, 2). Tatianus, who, just like Theophilus (*ad Autolyc.* 3, 16/30), devotes an important part of his work (*orat.* 36/41) to chronological computations for the purpose of demonstrating that Moses lived long before any Greek author, does not mention Belus in this context; hence we may be sure that in the *frag. Fuld.* Tert. has used Theophilus, especially because he makes the same error (322 instead of 922 years; see Waltz., *Ét.*, 472₂). Since, however, according to this calculation Moses lived 668 or 668 years before Saturn, how is it to be explained that Tert. in this passage mentions an interval of 900 years? La Cerda tried to make a different computation: "Moses lived 1000 years before the Trojan war; Saturn reigned in Italy 150 years before the arrival of Aeneas (Eusebius, Beda); so Moses lived about 850 years before Saturn". It seems much more probable that Tert. makes a mistake, perhaps even consciously, as he wishes to make the interval between Moses and the Egyptian Mercury as large as possible (this supposition is supported by the fact that he calls Mercury a great-grandson of Saturn instead of a grandson); but it is also possible that he wrote down without thinking this number of 900 years, with which he had been familiar since the time when he composed the *Apologeticum* (according to Theophilus' source, Moses and Saturn had been contemporaries!). For the authorities of Tert.'s chronological calculations, which need not concern us here, see Heinze, *Apol.*, 381; Waltz., *comm.*, 134 and *Ét.*, 472 *seqq.* (it seems that he himself has only consulted Joseph. c. *Apion.* 1, 16, 103 *seqq.*, Theophil., *loc. cit.*, and Tatian., *loc. cit.*). Concerning errors in Tert.'s writings, cf. the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3. — **pronepotibus**: erroneously instead of *nepotibus* (for this word certainly refers to the Egyptian Mercury). Perhaps we have here a reminiscence of *ad nat.* 2, 14, 10: *is* (sc. Asclepius), *etsi Apollinis filius, tam homo quam Iovis nepos, Saturni pronepos*. Concerning Saturn, cf. *apol.* 10 and *ad nat.* 2, 12. — **divinior** plays upon the double meaning of *divinus* 'divine' and 'prophesying'; this kind of pun was called ἀντανάκλασις (Quint. *instit.* 9, 3, 68), ἀντιμετάθεσις, or *ambiguum* (Cic. *de orat.* 2, 253). Instances from Tert.'s writings are given by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 171 (they are particularly numerous in *de pallio*, cf. Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 58, 61, 71, 76, 77; Gerlo, 2, 140). Moses is more divine than Saturn, but he is also a great prophet, the ἀρχιπροφήτης, as Philo puts it (*de somn.* 2, 189; for more passages from Philo, see Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, 152/3). This qualification of Moses, which occurs already in LXX Deuter. 34, 10, 18, 15 (= Act. apost. 3, 22, 7, 37), and Sap. Sal. 11, 1, is a very common one in early Christian literature, e. g. *Barnab.* 6, 8 (cf. Windisch's note, *Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 334); 1 *Clem.* 43, 1 (cf. Knopf's note, *ib.* p. 117); Justin, *apol.* 1, 32, 1; 1, 59, 1; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 35 and 3, 18; Tert. *frag. Fuld.* § 1: *primus propheta*; *cor.* 7, 21: *Moyses, propheticus, non poëticus pastor*; Orig. *homil. in Exod.* 3, 1;

Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 4, 17 (163 D); see also *Pap. Gr. mag.* V, 108 and the comm. on 2, 3: *propheticae paraturae*. *Divinus* = *divinans* perhaps also occurs in *ad nat.* 2, 15, 2 (Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 66; but cf. Borleffs' note). — *nativitates*: 'generations'; this meaning is very rarely found; from Tert. we may adduce *spect.* 30 (28, 19) and *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (515, 18). The adverb *temporativim* is used by Tert. only (also in *de pall.* 2, 2). The present passage may be quoted as an argument for the authenticity of the *fragmentum Fuldense*, which contains a very similar discussion (§ 1): *Primus enim prophetae, Moyses, qui mundi conditionem et generis humani pullulationem et mox ultricem iniquitatis illius aevi vim cataclysmi de praeterito exorsus est per vaticinationem usque ad suam aetatem et deinceps per res suas futurorum imagines edidit, penes quem et temporum ordo digestus ab initio suppurationem saeculi praestitit* (cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 141/5). — **probatus divinitatem** is the correct reading; see the note on 25, 6: *colorem . . . excoctae*. — **divinitatem . . . divinatione**: Tert. has a special liking for this pun, as is shown by *apol.* 20, 3: *idoneum, opinor, testimonium divinitatis veritas divinationis*; *ib.* 22, 7 (F): *ut hominem a recogitatu verae divinitatis avertant praestigiis falsae divinationis*; *ib.* 22, 9: (daemones) *aemulantur divinitatem, dum furantur divinationem*; we may also compare *test. an.* 5 (140, 26/7): *mirum, si a deo data* (sc. anima) *homini novit divinare?*

2. **Sanius sophista . . . ille Pythagoras**: Tert. purposely does not mention the name at the beginning of the sentence, just as in *de pall.* 3, 7: *atque adeo ipse qui Graecos praeter urbem censebat, litteras eorum vocemque senex iam eruditus, idem Cato . . .* and *bapt.* 8, 1: *sane humano ingenio licebit spiritum in aquam arcessere et concorporationem eorum accommodatis desuper manibus alio spiritu tantae claritatis animare: deo autem in suo organo non licebit*, etc. (cf. *an.* 14, 4: *specta portentosissimam Archimedis munificentiam, organum hydraulicum dico*); for more instances, see Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 11/2. Cf. Catull. 66, 43/6, where after a minute description of the Athos the name is mentioned only at the end; for Pindar, cf. Wilamowitz, *Pind.*, 183₂, for Apuleius, Bernhard, 93₄₅; on Verg. *Aen.* 2, 57 the Serv. auct. remarks: *ideo autem 'iuvenem' dicendo nomen suspendit, quo gravior narratio fieret*; cf. also Max. Tyr. *diss.* 17, 1; 18, 2; 19, 5; 25, 1. — **sophista** is used contemptuously instead of *philosophus* as in *apol.* 47, 2: *quis poetarum, quis sophistarum qui non omnino de prophetarum fonte potaverit?*; Tatian. *orat.* 25 (26, 28/9 Schw.): *ὁ κατ' Ἐπίκουρον σοφιστεύων*; *ib.* 35 (36, 26, 37, 18); 40 (41, 5) (Justin, the φιλόσοφος καὶ μάρτυς, and Athenagoras never use this qualification); Hippolyt. *refut.* 8, 11, 2; Ambrst. in 1 *Cor.* 15, 39; in *Galat.* 2, 1/2; Prudent. *perist.* 10, 404. 608; c. *Symm.* 2, 890. In *de pall.* 6, 2: *et grammaticus et rhetor et sophista et medicus et poeta*, the sense is different (cf. Gerlo, 2, 205, who rightly rejects the interpretation by Waltzing, *comm.*, 296). Irenaeus calls the Gnostics *sophistas* (3, 5, 1; 4, 1, 1; 4, 2, 1; 5, 20, 2 perhaps = *philosophus*, cf. *ib.* 3, 38, 2). In *idol.* 9 (39, 13): *aut sophistas aut Chaldaeos aut incantatores* the word

also expresses contempt without having the sense of *philosophus*; in *iei.* 7 (283, 9. 14) it denotes the Magi of the king of Babylon. In contrast with this it is used in a laudatory sense in *adv. Val.* 5 (182, 11/2): *Miltiades, ecclesiarum sophista* (similarly, Claud. Mamert. *de stat. anim.* 2, 9 calls Augustine a *spiritualis sophista*; in the *Acta Thomae* (*Act. apost. apocr.* II: 194, 9 Bonnet) we even find σοφῶν ὁ σοφίστης as a qualification of Christ; cf. Abt, *Apol. d. Apul.*, 171₄). The fact that Herodotus, too (4, 95), calls Pythagoras σοφιστής (not for the purpose of blaming him, as Stein supposes; cf. P. Corssen, *Rh. Mus. N. F.* 67 (1912), 45) has nothing to do with this passage; on the other hand, this qualification is particularly malicious, if Tert. has thought here of the tradition that Pythagoras was the first to call himself a φιλόσοφος (Heraclides Ponticus according to Cic. *Tusc.* 5, 3, 8 (probably in imitation of Arist. *Protrept.*; see Jaeger, *Aristoteles*, 99/100); Diog. Laërt. *prooem.* 12; Diodor. *Sic.* 10, 10, 1; Aët. 1, 3, 8, etc.; cf. Corssen, *op. cit.*, 35). — *recidivatu*: this subst. is only found in Tert.'s writings (four times in *de resurr. carn.*). — *revolubili* has the sense of a Greek medium as in *res.* 12 (41, 20): *totus . . . hic ordo revolubilis rerum*; Sil. Ital. 15, 237: *pelagi revolubilis unda*; Auson. *carm.* 5, 1, 12 (the passive sense, which is much more common, is found since Prop. 4, 7, 51 and Ovid *Ibis* 191); as to the sense, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6, 449: *rursus et in veterem fato revoluta figuram*. — *suffectio*: Tp; for *suffectura*, see Engelbrecht, *Wien. Stud.* 28 (1906), 149 and Bill, 91/2. — *temerario*: for this imposture was performed *cum iniuria bonae valetudinis* (§ 4). — *Cognosce qui nescis* = *si nescis*, like *scorp.* 1 (146, 17): *qui legeris, biberis*; for *adv. Marc.* 1, 19 (314, 16): *statim qui sapis plana res est*, see the note on 9, 1; cf. also Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 67 *seqq.*; 4, 88 *seqq.*; Löfst., *Krit.*, 68/9. — *Mortem simulat . . . redditus*: a burlesque description of Pythagoras' descent into Hades, as Callimachus' disciple Hermippus of Smyrna had been the first to give. Similar descriptions are found in Diog. Laërt. 8, 41: (τὸν Πυθ.) κατὰ γῆς οἰκίσκον ποιῆσαι καὶ τῇ μητρὶ ἐπιτείλασθαι τὰ γινόμενα εἰς δέλτον γράφειν . . . ἔπειτα καθιέναι αὐτῷ, ἔστ' ἂν ἀνέλθῃ . . . τὸν δὲ Π. μετὰ χρόνον ἀνελθεῖν ἰσχνὸν καὶ κατεσκελετευμένον εἰσελθόντα τε εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν φάσκειν, ὡς ἀφίχται ἐξ Ἀΐδου, καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκειν αὐτοῖς τὰ συμβεβηκότα (at the end of the chapter the name of Hermippus is mentioned), *schol. ad Soph. Electra* 62: Π. καθεῖρξας ἑαυτὸν ἐν ὑπογείῳ λογοποιεῖν ἐκέλευε τὴν μητέρα ὡς ἄρα τεθνηκῶς εἶη· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιφανεῖς περὶ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ τῶν καθ' Ἀΐδου τινὰ ἑτεραπεύετο διηγουμένος πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντας περὶ τῶν οἰκείων, οἷς ἐν Ἀΐδου συν-τετυχημένοι ἔλεγεν· ἐξ ὧν τοιαύτην ἑαυτῷ δόξαν περιέθηκεν, ὡς πρὸ μὲν τῶν Τρωικῶν Αἰθαλίδης ὧν ὁ Ἑρμοῦ, εἶτα Εὐφορβος, εἶτα Ἑρμότιμος, εἶτα Πύθιος ὁ Δῆλιος, εἶτα ἐπὶ πᾶσι Πυθαγόρας, and Suidas s. v. ἡδῆ (ed. A. Adler II: 552, 7 *seqq.*; part of this account (Πυθ. καθεῖρξας . . . ἔλεγεν) is identical to the preceding one); we may also compare Aeneas Gaz., *Theophrastus*, P. G. 85, 901 C. Rohde (*Psyche*, 2, 419/21) rightly points out that a Κατάβασις εἰς Ἀΐδου, which had a Pythagorean for its author, cannot possibly have combined an enumeration of these reincarnations with a description of a descent into Hades in this form.

However, when he qualifies this connection as 'arbitrary' (p. 419: "Es könnte ja scheinen (wie es einst mir schien, *Rhein. Mus.* 26, 558) als ob die Verbindung, in der die Sagen von den Vorgeburten mit einem Bericht von der Hadesfahrt des Pythagoras stehen im Schol. Soph. *El.* 62 und bei Tertullian, *de an.* 28, eine ursprüngliche sei, die Vorgeburten also in einer pythagoreischen κατάβασις εἰς ᾗδου erzählt worden seien. Aber die Verbindung ist eine willkürliche und in dem pythagoreischen Buch von der Hadesfahrt so nicht denkbar: denn die Hadesfahrt wird dort in der parodischen, die Wahrheit des Geschehenen aufhebenden Form erzählt, die ihr Hermipp gegeben hatte"), we are not to conclude that Tert. as well as the author of the scholion *ad Soph. El.* 62 independently combined these two accounts; it is much more probable that Tert.'s authority borrowed both from Hermippus. Rohde's view was combated by P. Corssen, who in his article '*Der Abaris des Herakleides Pontikos*' (*Rh. Mus. N. F.* 67 (1912), 20/47) contends that Pythagoras' descent into Hades as well as the various incarnations of his soul were mentioned in the dialogue *Abaris* by Heraclides Ponticus (a similar view is held by I. Lévy, *Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore* (Paris 1926), 25 and Daebritz, art. 'Herakleides', *R. E.* VIII, 476; cf., however, P. Boyancé, *Rev. Ét. Anc.* 36 (1934), 335/6). Concerning this chapter Corssen remarks (p. 24): "Wenn also Tertullian fragt: 'Quomodo credam non mentiri Pythagoram, qui mentitur ut credam?', so kann er auf den Gedanken, P. habe seinen Aufenthalt im Hades erdichtet, um seine Vorgeburten glaubhaft zu machen, doch nur dadurch gebracht sein, dass er die beiden Erzählungen bereits in enger Verbindung vorgefunden hätte. Sonst würde er vielmehr so argumentiert haben: weil P. in dem einen Falle nachweislich gelogen hatte, so nehme ich dies auch in dem anderen Falle an, wo ich es nicht nachweisen kann'. Diese Voraussetzung wird bestätigt durch das scholion zu *Electra* 62". Though I agree with Corssen about the fact that Tert. may have found both accounts in the same source (which however, drew upon Hermippus, not upon Heraclides Ponticus), I consider the argument underlying his view to be erroneous. The words *Quomodo credam . . . credam* do not refer to the incarnations of Pythagoras, but to the preceding sentences: according to the *senior sermo*, the quick proceed from the dead, but this legend is *falsus*, though *antiquitate* (∞ *senior*) *generosus*; its *testimonium*, the descent into Hades, is an imposture. The succeeding sentence is to be interpreted in this way: "How am I to believe that Pythagoras does not lie <, when he presumes that the quick proceed from the dead>, since he lies <when speaking about a descent into Hades>, to make me believe <that the quick proceed from the dead>?"'; after this the reincarnations are added as an *argumentum a fortiori*. Tert.'s argument runs exactly as, according to Corssen, it should have run if he had not found the two accounts in the same source: "since P. has surely lied in one case (viz. concerning his descent into Hades), we may assume the same in the other case (viz. with regard to his incarnations), for the tale about his incarnations is still harder to believe (*duriora*) than his κατάβασις" (of course this

does not prove that Tert. did not borrow both accounts from the same authority, though we may suppose that the structure of the argument is his own work). In the scholion *ad Soph. Electra* 62, too, the stories of Pythagoras' descent and of his reincarnations are less closely connected than Corssen assumes: Pythagoras returns to the earth, where he informs his hearers of the doctrine of regeneration and of the fates of their deceased relatives; the account of the reincarnations is kept separate from this; moreover, it is not represented as having been heard in Hades. Hence I assume that the truth lies midway between the views of Rohde and Corssen: Tert. could not find the descent into Hades together with the reincarnations in a *κατάβασις* written by a Pythagorean, but he borrowed both accounts from the same authority. It is highly improbable that this authority was Albinus (see Introduction, p. 41*); the most plausible supposition is that Albinus, who regarded the *vetus sermo* as *divinus*, not *Pythagoricus*, and so contested the view that the doctrine of metempsychosis derived from Pythagoras, in this context also gave the burlesque description of the *descensus. Septennio . . . damnat*: there is no need to alter the text as given by B. *damnare* here means 'to torment', 'to vex'; cf. § 4: *cum fraude vitae septennio excruciatæ*. For this use of *damnare* = *damno afficere*, see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 19, 75/20, 13, Blomgren, *Fort.*, 1, 160, and Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 96, who rightly points out that the *damnum* in question mostly consists in darkness or blindness (e. g. Lucan. 7, 452: *subitis damnavit noctibus Argos*), which in the present passage make this interpretation highly probable (cf. *umbra*, § 4). To the instances quoted in the Thes. l. L. we may add *carm. ad senator.* 29: *ingeniumque tuum turpes damnare per hymnos*; from a later period we may quote *Vita Germani Autissodor.* (*Acta Sanct.*, Iul. VII, 212 *seqq.*) 11: *ita pronus prostrata per terram membra damnaverat*. It is also possible, though much less probable, that the sense of *damnare* here approaches that of *claudere*, *obstruere* (cf. Thes. l. L. V, 1: 20, 43/9; Blomgren, *op. cit.*, 1, 161; Cavallin, 68; Lavarenne, 463). — *corpulentiam* = *corpus*, cf. 5, 1. — *omnem*: 'complete', see the comm. on 26, 1. — *mortui veteris*: similarly, e. g. *Didasc. apost.* 61, 32/4 Hauler: *Eliseus . . . vetustissimum iam mortuum suscitavit*. It seems not altogether out of the question that this description of Pythagoras was copied from the description of Homer in the preface of Ennius' *Annales* (frag. 7: *ei mihi qualis erat*; cf. J. Vahlen, *Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1896, 718; we must not forget that in his confutation of metempsychosis (33, 8) Tert. alludes to this preface). — *adytis fallaciae*: for the genit., cf. the note on 17, 12: *sententiam veritatis*.

3. For the place of *praesertim*, see Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*, 2, 364. — Tert. purposely writes *senior sermo* instead of *vetus sermo* (§ 1) with a view to the subsequent digression. — The words *Quid enim, . . . novellitatem?* are no more than an ironical parenthesis: "Thus the ancient tale says that the quick proceed from the dead — but why exactly should this be an ancient tale? Truth need not necessarily be ancient <, a 'new tale' may also be true; but this too

may be false, just like the ancient tale, for falsehood does not avoid younger traditions either". Tert. tinkers with conceptions familiar to him from a different context, viz., firstly, his doctrine about the priority of Truth (*apol.* 47, 1: *antiquior omnibus veritas*), which plays such an important part in his confutation of the heretics (it underlies the treatise *de praescript. haer.*; moreover, we may quote *adv. Prax.* 2 (229, 18/20): *iam hinc praeiudicatum sit id esse verum, quodcumque primum, id esse adulterum, quodcumque posterius*; *adv. Marc.* 3, 1 (377, 16/7): *illic scilicet pronuntiandam regulae interversionem, ubi posteritas invenitur*; *adv. Hermog.* 1; the numerous attacks on the novitas of Marcion's God, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (300, 24/6); 1, 8 (300, 19); 3, 3 (380, 1/3); 4, 4 = 429, 1), secondly, the opposite view that whatever arose at a later date, is more perfect (*exh. cast.* 6; *bapt.* 13, 1: *in omnibus posteriora concludunt et sequentia antecedentibus praevalent*). *Novellitas* occurs only in this passage and in *adv. Prax.* 2 (229, 17). — **Teneo**, 'I hold to my opinion that . . .', is often followed by an *accus. c. inf.* in Tert.'s writings, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 52. According to Rönisch, *It.*², 109, *falsum* is a subst. here, but we do better to understand *hunc sermonem*, cf. *iei.* 3 (277, 15): *teneo . . . homicidam gulam . . . puniendam* and *praescr.* 27, 6/7: *tenent correptas ab apostolo ecclesias*. — The next two sentences have already been explained in the comm. on § 2. — **ex falso** = *falsum* (cf. *Teneo plane falsum*); similarly, *apol.* 23, 4, in *falso* instead of the adverb (F; *de falso* V); *test. an.* 1 (135, 5); *de falso apol.* 2, 5 (F; *cum falso* V). — **credam . . . credam**: another instance of this *conversio* occurs in 57, 9: *et ideo per quem visurum se credidit, vidit, quia per quem vidit et credidit*; cf. Thörnell, *Apol.*, 158 and *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 138/9. — **Quomodo . . . fuisse**: with the exception of Euphorbus these incarnations of the soul of Pythagoras had been mentioned for the first time by Heraclides Ponticus; see Rohde, *op. cit.*, 417/9 (we may add *Hier. c. Rufin.* 3, 40, where a different order is found, viz. Euphorbus-Callides (instead of Aethalides-Hermotimus-Pyrrhus-Pythagoras). — **qui iterum se Pythagoran peieravit**: "who swore falsely that he was Pythagoras once more" = "that he, Pythagoras, had come back as Pythagoras" (cf. *ipse ex semetipso* in the next sentence), viz. after his descent into Hades. By this sentence Corssen's view that, according to Tert., Pythagoras invented his stay in Hades to make his various reincarnations credible is clearly confuted: Pythagoras invented these incarnations just like his descent into Hades to make his new doctrine about the origin of the quick from the dead acceptable. Now, where Pythagoras certainly lied about his resurrection from Hades (*qui . . . peieravit* = *quia . . . peieravit*), his former incarnations, which are much harder to believe, are still greater lies, which makes all arguments supporting his wonderful doctrine invalid! The subsequent sentence (where of course *duriora* refers to the reincarnations, *molliora* to the descent into Hades) repeats this argument in a different form. After *peierare* an *accus. c. infin.* is very rarely found (*Prop.* 4, 3, 41/2; *Suet. Nero* 28, 1); after *deierare* it occurs from Plaut. *Cas.* 670 downwards (from Tert.'s writings cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 26 (371, 25/6), where the verb is opposed to *peierare*).

As to the argument, we may compare *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (389, 7/9; Tert. discusses Marcion's Christ who, according to this heretic, had a phantom body): *an credam ei de interiore substantia, qui sit de exteriore frustratus? quomodo verax habebitur in occulto tam fallax repertus in aperto?* — **Quanto . . . mentitus est:** we should expect (*in*) *quantum . . . (in) tantum*, but the comparative *credibilis* (*quanto credibilis* occurs in *adv. Herm.* 26 = 154, 23) has induced Tert. to write *quanto*, which also makes him put *tanto* (but *tanto* is no more to be connected with the following comparative). As to the use of *credibilis*, cf. *bapt.* 15, 2: *sed circa haereticos sane quae custodiendum sit, dignius qui retractet* (T.; Borleffs *ad loc.*: "dignius faciat (vel retractet) qui retractet"). — *ipse ex semetipso*: similarly, in *apol.* 48, 3 (there too metempsychosis is discussed): *hominem ex homine rediturum*. — *durioribus*, sc. *creditu*; similarly, *bapt.* 5, 5: *nequis durius credat angelum dei sanctum aquis in salutem hominis temperandis adesse*; Aug. *enarr. in evang. Iohann.* 72, 2: *durum est, absurdum est, ferri non potest*.

4. "**Sed . . . probavit**": for this story, cf. the passages collected by Rohde, 417/8. — **Delphis**: since all other sources mention the temple of Hera at Argos (with the sole exception of Diog. Laërt. 8, 1, 5, who speaks of the sanctuary of the Branchidae), it seems probable that Tert. commits a mistake here, as he often does with respect to details which do not interest him (see the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3). — **hypo-geum** occurs from Petron. and Vitruv. downwards; cf. Heraeus, *Die Sprache des Petron und die Glossen* (*Progr. Gymn. Offenbach*, Leipsic 1899), 26; Konjetzny, 302. — **si capit**, sc. *credi*; for this ellipsis, cf. the comm. on ch. 4. — **stropham**: this word rarely occurs in the singular (from Plin. min. and Martial. downwards). — **bonae valetudinis**: cf. 6, 8. — **fraude**: this word supports the interpretation of *damnat* = *damno afficit* in § 2. — **accesserit temeritatem**: for the accus. after *accedere* (occurring for the first time in Plaut. *Epid.* 149: *ego istuc accedam periculum potius atque audaciam*), cf. Bennett, 2, 217/8 (the Thes. l. L. is rather vague about this; the accus. is avoided by Cic. and Caes., and very common in Apul.). — **curiositatem** in this passage has the concrete sense of 'magic trick' (cf. § 5); for more instances, see Rönsch, *Sem.*, 1, 22/3 and Thes. l. L. IV: 1491 (very often in Aug.). The signification '*superstitio*' is found for the first time in Tert., e. g. *praescr.* 40, 15; in *idol.* 9 (38, 11) the word refers to astrology; cf. also the note on 2, 4.

5. **historiis**: cf. the note on 23, 4. — **defectae**: this partic. (from Ovid *fasti* 3, 674 downwards) also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (323, 4). — **famae aurulas**: cf. e. g. Cic. *pro Mur.* 35: *parva . . . aura rumoris*; Verg. *Aen.* 7, 646; Curt. 4, 5, 12; Thes. l. L. II: 1479, 9/36 (we may add Arnob. 2, 19: *suspicionis alicuius . . . aura*). *aurula* (also *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 = 346, 5) is Tp.; similarly, Aug. *c. Iulian. op. imperf.* 6, 1: *solis fama aurulis*; cf. also *ad nat.* 1, 10, 41: *afflatus veritatis*. — **aedituo** is the correct reading (*aedetuo* A; *aedetus* Gloss. III: 171, 22), cf. *ad nat.* 1, 15, 3; 2, 10, 2, 5; *apol.* 15, 7; *cult. fem.* 2, 1, 1. — **Scimus . . .**

spiritus: the explanation of this sentence depends on the interpretation of *catabolicos*. Oehler says: "catabolicos interpretor arrepticios homines et energumenos, quos videlicet daemones humi adfligere atque prosternere solent, a καταβάλλειν dictos", after which he adduces Salmasius (*In Script. Hist. Aug.*, p. 40) who regards the *catabolici* as demons and proposes to read *magiam elicere explorandis occultis catabolicos*, whereas in the *Plinianae exercitationes in Solinum*, p. 768, he adheres to the reading of the *Agobardinus*. Salmasius is certainly right, as is shown, firstly, by the circumstance that the *catabolici* here are put on a level with the *paredri* and *pythonici spiritus*, secondly, by the only two passages where the *catabolici* are also mentioned in Latin literature, viz. Potam. *tract.* 2 (P. L. 8, 1416 B): *Belias... mathematicus, catabolicorum fatidicorum et pythonicorum antistes* and Fulgent. *de Verg. contin.* (86, 2/3 Helm): *quae aut Dardanus in dinameris aut Battiaades in paredris aut Campester in catabolicis infernalibusque cecinerunt*; in the first passage the *catabolici* are connected with the *pythonici*, in the second with the *paredri*, so that it is certain that Tert. mentions three kinds of demons. Concerning the functions of these *catabolici* we hear nothing more than Tert. tells us, viz. that they were invoked by magicians, but as the etymology of the word is clear, we are perfectly justified in connecting them with such descriptions of magical performances as mention a collapse of the medium (mostly a παῖς ἄφθορος), e. g. Tert. *apol.* 23, 1: *si pueros in eloquium oraculi elidunt* (sc. magi); Hippolyt. *refut.* 4, 28, 3: (the fallacious magician) ἐπὶ γῆς βαλὼν τὸν παῖδα πολλὰ ἐπιλέγει αὐτῷ; Acta Thom. 64 (Act. apost. apocr. II, 2 p. 181); Apul. *apol.* 42: *puerum quempiam carmine cantatum* (sc. a mago) *remotis arbitris, secreto loco, arula et lucerna et paucis consciis testibus, ubi incantatus sit, corruisse, postea nescientem sui excitatum*; cf. Abt, *Apol. d. Apul.*, 160 seqq. and Th. Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 2, 134/40 (§§ 278/93). — *magiae licere explorandis occultis*: "that magic has <great> power to explore secret things"; this right interpretation was given by Thörnell, *Eran.* 7 (1907), 93/5, who adduces many passages where *licet mihi* is connected with adjectives such as *quantum, tantum*, and has the meaning 'possum, valeo', e. g. *pat.* 15 (22, 17): *quantum patientiae licet*, "how powerful is patience"; *adv. Marc.* 2, 26 (372, 20); *mart.* 4; *apol.* 9, 17; *pall.* 2, 5. In this passage we find an absolute use of *licet*; a similar use of *posse* occurs (cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 46) in *adv. Val.* 4 (180, 26): *quia et ingenio poterat et eloquio* (sc. Valentinus); *pall.* 6, 1: *quis oculis in eum potest, in quem membris non potest*. For *licet*, cf. *ad nat.* 1, 10, 49: *licet vobis in eos...* ("you possess (great) power against those..."); see also Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 96/7; Petr. *Chrysol. serm.* 16: *quibus* (sc. daemonibus) *in porcos iussum est ut liceret*. — **paredros**: the word is no ἄ. λ., as Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 144) indicates; cf. the passage just quoted from Fulgentius, and *Iren. lat.* 1, 7, 2; 1, 16, 3; 1, 20, 2. The δαίμων πάρεδρος is the *spiritus familiaris* of the middle ages; in Latin he is called *daemon adsistens* or *adsidens*: *Min. Fel.* 26, 9: *ad nutum et arbitrium adsidentis sibi daemonis*; Tert. *apol.* 23, 1: (magi) *habentes semel invitorum angelorum et daemonum adsistentem sibi*

potestatem (according to Waltz. (*comm.*, 169), Tert. here follows Justin *apol.* 1, 18, 3: καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι παρὰ τοῖς μάγοις ὄνειροπομποὶ καὶ πάρεδροι); Rufin., *transl.* Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 2, 14, 5: *utens adminiculo adsistentis sibi et adhaerentis daemonicae virtutis quam πάρεδρον vocant* (cf. Sulpic. Sever. *dial.* 3, 8, 3: *quod intellexerit egisse se semper adsidentis sibi diaboli voluntatem*). The δαιμόνιον of Socrates was regarded as a δαίμων πάρεδρος by Tert. (cf. the note on 1, 4), Min. Fel. (26, 9), and Lact. (*div. inst.* 2, 14, 9: *Socrates esse circa se ad s i d u m daemona loquebatur*). These demons are very often mentioned in magical papyri, cf. Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 29/30. 78. 91. 219; 2, 79. *paredrus* is still found in medieval Latin, see Du Cange s. v. — *pythonicos*: the δαίμονες ἐργαστήριμοι, who are often mentioned in the Old Testament (Lev. 20, 27; Deuter. 18, 11; 1 Reg. 28, 7; 4 Reg. 21, 6; 23, 24; Ies. 8, 19; 19, 3; 44, 25), and in Act. apost. 16, 16 (παίδισκη ἔχουσα πνεῦμα Πυθῶνος, cf. Radermacher *N T Gramm.*, 11/2). Concerning this conception in pagan antiquity, cf. Schoemann-Lipsius, *Gr. Altert.*, 24, 313; Gruppe, 1, 101 *seqq.* and 2, 928₁; Tamborino, *De antiquorum daemonismo*, 59/60; Blaydes' note on Arist. *Vesp.* (Halle 1893), p. 371; E. Bethe, *Rh. Mus.* 62 (1907), 467, and in general Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, 166/7; Wikenhauser, *Apostelgeschichte*, 401/7; Hopfner, *op. cit.*, 2, 133 (§ 276); Cumont, *L'Égypte des astrologues*, 161₄. To the passages collected by these scholars we may add *Didasc. apost.* 22, 3/4 Hauler and Gregor. Turon. *hist. Franc.* 7 (321, 28). The Pythia was often regarded as haunted by a πνεῦμα Πυθῶνος, cf. e. g. the scholion on Aristoph. *Plutus* 39 and Chrysost. *homil.* 29, 1 in 1 *ep. ad Cor.* (P. G. 61, 242); cf. also the note on 57, 8. — *Non*: instead of *nonne*, cf. 18, 7. — *Pherecydes*: this note may come from a book Περὶ θαυμασίων, cf. e. g. Apollon. *mirab.* 6: τῆς Φερεκύδου τερατοποιίας (more about this subject in the note on 2, 3 and in the Introduction, p. 47*). For Pherecydes as the inventor of the doctrine of metempsychosis, cf. Suidas s. v. Φ.; Tatian. *orat.* 25: Πυθαγόρας Εὐφορβος γεγενῆναι φησὶ καὶ τοῦ Φερεκύδους δόγματος κληρόνομος εἶστί. For the view that Pythagoras was a magician, cf. Plin. *n. h.* 24, 156, 160; 25, 13; 30, 9; Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 2, 5; Jamblich. *vit. Pythag.*, *passim*; *Acta Archelai* 68, 6: *Huius* (sc. 'Manichaei') *heresis de Pythagorae fonte libatur et commixta magicis artibus astrologia quoque utuntur, sicut et ipse Pythagoras de his exordium sumit*. — *somniabat*: this verb is very often used in patristic literature with regard to pagan philosophers, e. g. *ad nat.* 2, 13, 1: *Varro et qui cum eo somniaverunt*; *adv. Val.* 10 (188, 3/4; referring to the Gnostics); Hier. *ep.* 60, 4, 2 (Pythagoras); Clem. Alex. *strom.* 7, 6, 32, 8: Πυθ. καὶ οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν μετένδесιν ὄνειροπολοῦντες τῆς ψυχῆς; Pelag. *ad Ephes.* 1, 4. — Just like the argument in § 3, the confutation of the last-mentioned argument in favour of metempsychosis, viz. the recognition by Pythagoras of the shield of Euphorbus, takes as its starting-point the fallacious descent into Hades (§ 4: *Respice ad hypogeum eius et, si capis, crede. Nam qui talem commentus est stropham . . .*). In § 5 no less than five possibilities are enumerated to explain how Pythagoras may have become acquainted with the shield in question. Of these the three

first (reading of secret books, rumour, bribery of the guardian) were quite easy to invent; the fourth (magic) is due to a note about Pherecydes' magical practices, whereas the fifth ('the same demon may have dwelt in Euphorbus and Pythagoras') is typical of Tert. and recalls his remarks on Socrates (cf. 1, 4); it seems very probable that it is this supposition which contains Tert.'s real opinion. The last sentence of the chapter is completely similar to the end of 24, 11 (*Plato . . . recordatus est*).

29. *Confutations of Plato's statement* (PHAEDO 72 A): τοὺς ζῶντας ἐκ τῶν τεθνεώτων γεγενῆναι οὐδὲν ἥττον ἢ τοὺς τεθνεώτας ἐκ τῶν ζώντων.

"The fact that the dead proceed from the living is no sufficient proof that the living should arise from the dead, for in the beginning there were only <τῶ> living beings <viz. Adam and Eve>; therefore the dead come after the living and can only have proceeded from them, whereas the living need by no means have originated from the dead (§ 1). If Plato were right, this original law <viz. "the dead proceed from the living, not the living from the dead"> would have changed in course of time, but for such a change no adequate reason can be found; besides, in that case this law would only have changed in part <i. e. originally: "the living do not proceed from the dead", afterwards: "they do">; for Plato, too, would have to admit that one part remains unchanged, the dead continuing to proceed from the living (§ 2). But even if we assume for a moment that the original rule may indeed have changed in part, that does not yet imply that Plato's principle 'ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων' should be valid without any restriction: for instance, old age proceeds from youth, but youth does not arise from old age, etc. (§ 3). This difficulty was realized by Albinus who, for the purpose of saving his master's sentence, assumed different kinds of contrasts — a fruitless endeavour, for youth and old age are contrary to each other in exactly the same way as life and death (§ 4)".

The argument in § 1 (*Ab initio enim vivi priores*) is based on a consideration of 'the original situation' described in Genesis (for further details about this *primordii contemplatio*, which plays so important a part in this treatise, see comm. on 9, 7). It introduces a totally new conception into the discussion of metempsychosis, which for Tert. makes confutation easy. The interpretation of the rest of the chapter depends on the question where to finish the last sentence of § 2 (see comm.).

It is curious that Methodius uses this same sentence of Plato to demonstrate that at the resurrection the living will arise from the dead (cf. comm. on 43, 12). Tert. undoubtedly would have rejected this possibility, because it might endanger the doctrine of the Church that the resurrection will take place once only; it is the defence of this very dogma which lies at the root of the author's whole confutation of metempsychosis. For the question of sources, see the Introduction, p. 41*.

1. **Mortuos . . . vivos**: repeated from 28, 1; cf. *praescr.* 30, 50/1: *illi (apostoli) enim de mortuis vivos faciebant, isti (haeretici) de vivis mortuos faciunt*. — **Ab initio**: 'since the creation'; cf. e. g. 21, 1: *ab initio in Adam*. The second sentence again contains an abridged syllogism; the complete form would be: A. *Ab initio vivi priores*, i. e. (*unde*) *ab initio mortui posteriores*. <B. *Posterius efficitur ex priori*>. C. *Ergo mortui non aliunde orti sunt quam ex vivis*. After *non aliunde* the part. ὄντες should be understood (see the note on 5, 4). — In the sense of *potius, magis* occurs eight times in *de an.* (this meaning of *magis* is found from Catull. 68, 30 and Cic. *ad Att.* 10, 8, 2 downwards); cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 84 *seq.* The same variation occurs in *cult. fem.* 1, 1, 1 and *adv. Marc.* 2, 1 (333, 18/9).

2. **ex mortuis . . . ex mortuis**: for this repetition, cf. the numerous instances quoted by Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 4 *seqq.* — **Defecerat . . . fons**: in Thes. l. L. VI: 1027, 18/9 this passage only is mentioned; cf. also Cypr. *ep.* 74, 10: *si canalīs aquam ducens . . . subito deficiat*; Lactant. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 23 (*defectio fluminum, fontium*, etc. is frequently found, e. g. Sen. *nat. quaest.* 4, 2, 16; cf. Thes. l. L. V, 1: 289, 47 *seqq.*). *deficere* is more than once used in polemical passages, for instance *iei.* 9 (285, 7/8): *defecerant corvi qui eum (sc. Helian) liberalius pascere?*; *adv. Val.* 8 (186, 15/6): *interim in tricenario fecunditas tota deficit*; Min. Fel. 24, 3: *nisi forte iam Iuppiter senuit et partus in Iunone defecit*. Cf. also Epiphan. haer. 48, 2: ("Why have there not been any Montanistic prophets after Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla?") Ἄρα ἡγορήσεν ἡ χάρις; — **origini** (A) is defended by Löfstedt (*Synt.*, 1, 167), who for this use of the dat. compares *ball.* 2, 2: *sic et mari fides infamis, ad nat.* 1, 7, 10: *aetati nostri nondum anni CCL* (but Borleffs writes *aetatis!*), and *spect.* 12 (14, 19): *haec muneri origo*. All the same we must not lose sight of the fact that in the instances adduced by Löfstedt the substantives placed in the dative may be regarded as the logical subject of the sentence (e. g. *haec muneri origo* = *hanc munus originem habuit*); the same holds good of such passages as Tac. *hist.* 1, 67 *initium bello fuit avaritia* (*ann.* 15, 49; for the dative connected with *initium, principium* etc., cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 416; Landgraf, A. L. L. 8, 62/9; Sverr., *Pallad.*, 222) or Cic. *Acad.* 1, 18 *idem fons erat utrisque* (*de republ.* 6, 27), so that the strictly attributive use found in this passage (*ille . . . origini fons*) remains an exception. As, however, an equally exceptional case of an attributive *dativus finalis* occurs in 48, 3 (*fabam . . . onerosum et inflatu i* (= πνευματώδες) *pabulum*), it seems advisable to retain the reading of A. It stands to reason that such cases as *paen.* 7, 8: *Christo servus*, which is equivalent to *Christo serviens* (cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 69₃) are of a different nature. After *est* no comma is to be put, cf. e. g. 36, 4: *qua lineas duxerit quaecumque illa est ratio naturae*. — **formae**: viz. the 'original rule', the *forma primordii* (26, 5; 31, 1; 36, 4) or *initii* (§ 2), according to which "*mortui ex vivis oriuntur, vivi non ex mortuis*": either the *fons animarum* (cf. 20, 6) should have 'run dry', so that there would be no other possibility for the living but

to arise from the dead, or the original law would have been abolished, but only in part, for its first half '*mortui ex vivis*' would have retained its full force: *et quomodo in mortuis* (= quod ad originem mortuorum pertinet) *salva est*? In the sequel the argument has been contracted once more: "Is it not so that the law concerning the genesis of the dead was preserved because it goes back to the origin of the world? <But if this is true, the other part of this rule should have remained valid too,> for either . . .". — **Si non . . . alternant**: the interpretation of this sentence depends on the punctuation. We may consider the subordinate clause *si non peraequare deberet fides institutionis* as a pleonastic repetition of the words *aut in utraque mutasset*. Such pleonasm is by no means rare in Tert.'s writings; a parallel is found in 44, 3: *si non magis in proximo esset somnium credi, quod vigilantibus potius accidere deberet, si non somnium magis credi oporteret*, where, as Thörnell has shown, the words *si non somnium magis credi oporteret* (*si oporteret* ∞ *si deberet* in this passage) are no more than a further explication or repetition of the participle *vigilanti*. Out of the instances adduced by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 79 *seqq.*) we may mention *adv. Prax.* 22 (271, 1/3): *adeo totum hoc perseverabat inducere ut duo tamen crederentur in una virtute, quia aliter filius credi non posset, nisi duo crederentur*; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 2, 25 (371, 15/7); *ib.* 2, 11 (351, 10/3): *nec species solummodo, sed tutela reputanda bonitatis, quia bonitas, nisi iustitia regatur, ut iusta sit, non erit bonitas, si iniusta sit* (according to Kroymann, the various parts of this sentence belong to different editions of *Adv. Marc.*; this view has justly been confuted by Bill, 98 and Thörnell, *op. cit.*, 74); for the pleonastic addition of a hypothetical clause after *alioquin*, see comm. on 48, 2, for instances from other authors, Wahlén, 121 and Petersson, 28/9. Besides, Hartel is certainly right in pointing out (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 67) that the alternate use of an imperfect subjunctive (*deberent*) and a present indicative (*alternant*) is somewhat surprising (hence Vollmer proposes to read *alternarent*). In spite of these considerations I prefer to retain the traditional punctuation on account of the interpretation of *peraequare*. This passage is usually regarded as containing the only existing instance of an intransitive use of *peraequare* ('sich gleich bleiben', Hoppe, *Synt.*, 136); however, it is much more plausible that here, too, the meaning should be transitive (though the object is not mentioned): 'to balance', i. e. "equally to maintain the validity of both parts <of the original law>"; cf. 2, 2: *Formas rebus imponit, eas nunc peraequat, nunc privat*. The subordinate clause may be paraphrased in this way: "if the original law (*fides institutio*, i. e. *institutio (forma instituta) fideliter servata*; Hartel's translation "the belief in that institution" is absurd) was not destined equally to maintain the validity <of both parts>, in other words, if in spite of all *forma instituta in altera parte perseverasset, in altera mutasset*, we may still deny universal validity to Plato's statement $\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha \epsilon\zeta \epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\omega\nu$ (the present indicat. *alternant* is due to the circumstance that this is an established fact). Consequently, even if we pass over all logical difficulties (which, however, we must

by no means do), Plato is still wrong". This interpretation is in perfect accordance with Tert.'s usual method of arguing; as a parallel we may adduce the 'gradual' argumentation in ch. 17 and 24 (see pp. 240 and 306). It should also be observed that *effici mortuos* gives a better clausula than *fides institutionis*. — *mutasset*: the verb has intransit. force (from Liv. 3, 10, 6 downwards), which is particularly frequent in *de pall.* (see Gerlo, 2, 40). *demutare* is used intransitively in *adv. Marc.* 4, 15 (463, 28), *variare*, *ib.* 4, 2 (426, 17).

3. *reformari alternant*: the only other instance of *alternare* with an infin. is found in Claudian. *Mam. de stat. anim.* 3, 5: *localis erit animus, quia vivificare Christi corpus alternaverit*. Junius translates ἀναμορφοῦσθαι παραλλάττουσιν. Probably we have to assume a Grecism here, which may be due to the fact that Tert. consulted Albinus on this passage (see the next note); such quotations as are found in 18, 1/2. 28, 1. 42, 1 clearly show how literally Tert. usually translates from the Greek. The accus. after *alternare* in *pall.* 3, 2: *hyaena . . . marem et feminam alternat* is no less remarkable. *contrarietas* (which occurs ten times in Tert.'s works) is Tp. — Next Tert. adduces four instances of contrasts; of course it is possible that they should have been invented by himself, but as he remarks that Albinus *subtiliter quaerit contrarietatum genera distinguere*, it is more probable that he borrowed them from this authority. Albinus combined Aristotle's doctrine of the different kinds of contrasts with Plato's sentence ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων; as we know no more about his theory than a rather obscure sentence from his Ἐπιτομή (cf. the note on § 4), we are not able to check Tert. here. However, a certain compensation for this deficiency in our knowledge of middle Platonism is supplied by the detailed discussion of the ἐναντία in Olympiodorus' commentary on the *Phaedo* (ed. W. Norvin, Leipzig 1913). Olympiodorus informs us (132, 4 seqq. N.) that the older commentators did not yet understand the importance of the principle ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων, nor could defend it successfully against the attacks of the adherents of other schools (from the commentary it is evident that Strato of Lampsacus was the most important opponent), till Jamblichus ἐσπούδασεν αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν τῶν ἐναντίων λόγον) τελεώσασθαι εἰς τοσοῦτον, εἰς ὅσον ἀποδείξει παντελῆ τὴν ψυχῆς ἀθανάσιαν, οὐδὲ Σωκράτους αὐτοῦ τηλικούτον ἐπ' αὐτῷ φρονήσαντος. On the other hand, Syrianus, the teacher of Proclus, tried καὶ ταῖς Σωκράτους ἐπαγγελίαις ἐμμένειν, but as he οὐ τέλος ἔκετο μύθων, Olympiodorus was forced to add many details himself. In his commentary the Aristotelian doctrine περὶ τῶν ἐναντίων is continually referred to; we may be sure that, besides the alterations mentioned by Olympiodorus, there was an older nucleus of arguments and examples, so that many arguments mentioned by Olympiodorus may have occurred in Albinus' work. At all events, Albinus as well as the Neoplatonists obviously took the principle ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων to hold good for the ἐναντία in a narrower sense only, so that the ἐναντία πρὸς τι, ἕξις-στέρησις, and κατάφασις-ἀντίφασις were left out of consideration; as to Albinus, this is evident from his own words (see the note

on § 4). Olympiodorus says nothing about the κατάφασις and αντίφασις; the ἐναντία πρὸς τι only proceed from each other καθὸ ἐναντίων μετέχει (A X 8), whereas in the case of ἕξις and στέρησις reciprocity is out of the question (*ib.* p. 61, 18/20 N.: ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἕξις εἰς τὴν στέρησιν μεταβάλλει, οὐ μὴν ἡ στέρησις εἰς τὴν ἕξιν; cf. also p. 141, 31 *seqq.*, 228 *seqq.*, and especially 126, 6/9). Two of the instances quoted by Tert. are also found elsewhere, viz. the contrasts *visualitas-caecitas* and *iuventa-senecta*. The first was already used by Aristotle himself as an example of ἕξις and στέρησις; he also pointed out that they cannot proceed mutually from each other (*Categ.* 10 (13a 35/6): οὐτε γὰρ τυφλὸς γενόμενός τις πάλιν ἀνέβλεψεν). Chrysippus, too, discussed this example, as is shown by Simplicius in *Aristot. categ.* fol. 101 E edit. Basil. (= *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 178): ἕξεως δὲ καὶ στέρησεως οὐ δυνατόν εἰς ἄλληλα μεταβολὴν γίνεσθαι. τυφλότης μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ὀφθαλμοῦ γίνεται, οὐκέτι μέντοι καὶ ἀνάπαλιν. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐζήτησεν, εἰ τυφλοὺς ῥητέον τοὺς ὑποχυθέντας, δυναμένους δὲ ἐκ παρακεντήσεως ἀναβλέψαι, καὶ ἐφ' ὧν τὰ βλέφαρα κέκλεισται· τῆς γὰρ δυνάμεως οὕσης εἰσὶν ἐκείνοι τῷ καταμεμυκότες τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἢ τῷ καλυμμένῳ ὁρᾶν διὰ τι παραπέτασμα, οὐ ἀφαιρεθέντος οὐδὲν καλύεται ὁρᾶν. διὸ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ στέρησεως εἰς ἕξιν γίνεται ἢ τοιαύτη μεταβολή. λαμβάνει δὲ νῦν στέρησιν τὴν κατὰ πῆρωσιν; moreover, cf. Olympiodorus p. 141, 31 *seqq.*: παθὸν δὲ οὐδὲν τὴν στέρησιν ἀνακάμπτει πρὸς τὴν ἕξιν· οὐτε γὰρ τυφλότης εἰς ὄψιν. The second example was already adduced as a counter-argument by Strato (Olympiodorus D ξγ' ('Απορίαι Στράτωνος πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων), ε' = 221, 33): εἰ ἐκ νέων γέροντες, οὐ μὴν ἀνάπαλιν; to this Olympiodorus reposts (222, 27/8): ἕξιν εἶναι καὶ στέρησιν νεότητα καὶ γῆρας (for other, rather meticulous, arguments, see A IX 4/5 = 53, 12/54, 23; A X 5 = 59, 22 *seqq.*; 127, 6/13). We may suppose that Tert. became acquainted with these examples through Albinus, who must have excluded these contrasts (as to the first instance this is certain) from the κυρίως ἐναντία, and consequently from the μεταβολὴ τῶν ἐναντίων. Thus Tert. uses arguments against Albinus which the latter had already taken into account; undoubtedly he was confident that no one of his readers would consult the treatise of Albinus! It stands to reason that a real confutation ought to have reckoned with the κυρίως ἐναντία only. — *visualitas* is found nowhere else. — *marcescat*: cf. such cases as *pall.* 3, 2: (cervus) *languescit in iuventutem* (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 27) or *Plin. n. h.* 11, 242: *omni in salem caseo senescente*; *Plut. ap. Euseb. praepr. evang.* 11, 11 (528C): ἐφθάρη δὲ ὁ νέος εἰς τὸν ἀκμάζοντα καὶ ὁ παῖς εἰς τὸν νέον. — *nec...acuatur*: cf. 20, 4: *quae...vel acuiunt vel obtundunt*. Perhaps this sentence has been borrowed from *Sen. ep.* 76, 19: *stultitia ad sapientiam erepit, sapientia in stultitiam non revolvitur*.

4. Albinus: *Epit.* 25 (177, 30 *seqq.* Herm.): τὰ τε ἄμεσα ἐναντία καὶ μὴ καθ' αὐτὰ ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς πέφυκεν ἐξ ἀλλήλων γίνεσθαι· ἐναντίον δὲ τοῦτο, ὃ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ζῆν, τῷ τεθνάναι· ὥς οὖν ὁ θάνατος διάκρισις ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ζωὴ σύνοδος ψυχῆς,

οὐσης δηλονότι πρόσθεν, καὶ σώματος. Though not everything in this passage is immediately clear, which in part may be due to the fact that it belongs to an epitome (two syllogisms have been confused here), this much is evident that Albinus regarded life and death as ἄμεσα ἐναντία καὶ μὴ καθ' αὐτὰ ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, and so contended that they might proceed from each other. It is remarkable that he thought a γένεσις ἐξ ἀλλήλων to exist for ἄμεσα ἐναντία only, whereas Aristotle declared that ἔμμεσα ἐναντία, too, might arise from each other (this is shown by the instances adduced in *categ.* 10 (13a 22 *seqq.*), e. g. white and black, which have grey as their μέσον); Olympiodorus even says (A X 10 = 62, 10/1; cf. 126, 10/6) that, according to Plato, all ἐναντία are ἔμμεσα. The addition μὴ καθ' αὐτὰ ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός may perhaps be explained with the aid of this same author. In A IX 2 (52, 9 *seqq.*) he declares that Plato assumes two kinds of ἐναντία, viz. qualities (ποιότητες) and things possessing qualities (τὰ ἔχοντα τὰς ποιότητας). The former cannot merge into one another, διότι οὐδὲν μέρος τῆς λευκότητος ἐν τῇ μετὰβολῇ τῇ εἰς τὸ μέλαν; this is only possible for τὰ . . . δεδεγμένα σώματα. If contrasts change into each other, there must be something which remains unchanged. After these preliminary remarks he reports the following argument of Syrianus: death and life are a διάκρισις and σύγκρισις (cf. the text of Albinus), and as such they are ἐναντία which, however, being ποιότητες, cannot straight away merge into one another; hence there must be something which in the process of changing remains unchanged, and this can only be the soul, as the body is annihilated by death: from this the conclusion may be drawn that the soul remains unchanged, and so is eternal. Here the γένεσις ἐξ ἀλλήλων of life and death is presupposed, and from this the immortality of the soul is inferred (a different argument, also ascribed to Syrianus, occurs in A X 3 (58, 21/5): „death and life are a διάκρισις and σύγκρισις, and so are ἐναντία; ἐναντία proceed from each other, hence life and death proceed from each other”). It is clear that life and death are regarded as passing states of the eternal soul (cf. Albinus: . . . οὕτω καὶ ἡ ζωὴ σύνοδος ψυχῆς, οὕσης δηλονότι πρόσθεν, καὶ σώματος), and so are contrasts which exist κατὰ συμβεβηκός only (in the text of Albinus we must understand ὄντα after μὴ καθ' αὐτά). The same is stated in other passages, e. g. 144, 1 *seqq.*: “All οὐσίαι are more durable than their συμβεβηκότα; this is an argument for the truth of the λόγος . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων: οὐ γὰρ τῶν μὲν (sc. ἐναντίων) τῶν δὲ οὐ βεβαιότερα (sc. αἱ οὐσίαι εἰσιν), ἀλλὰ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν περὶ αὐτὰς ἐναντίων, ἅτε γιγνομένων καὶ ἀπογιγνομένων, ὥστε καὶ τοῦ διαζεύγνυσθαι καὶ συζεύγνυσθαι πρὸς τὸ σῶμα (= ὥστε καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ βίου) · συμβέβηκε γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ταῖς ψυχαῖς οὐσίαις οὐσαις; 145, 27/31: ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν τῷ ζῶντι συνέζευκται σῶματι ἡ ψυχὴ, εἴτα διαζεύγνυται ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, τότε κυκλίζεται τῶν ἐναντίων ἡ μεταβολή, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνδέχεται αὐτὴν κυκλίζεσθαι περὶ μίαν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ὑπομένουσαν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἐφ' ὅσον ἔστι χρόνον; *ib.* 149, 9/13. It seems highly probable that the argument here ascribed to Syrianus occurred already in the treatise

of Albinus; in that case it also becomes clear why Tert. says that Albinus *subtiliter quaerit contrarietatum genera distinguere*. — Haec refers to the instances quoted in § 3. — absolute, i. e. definite, certo; see comm. on 21, 7. Tert. explicitly refuses to distinguish different kinds of contrasts; it stands to reason that Albinus would have considered this confutation to be of no value whatever. — *Nec tamen... deferatur*: *tamen* underlines the contrast with the words *quaerit... distinguere*, which had already been confuted by the subordinate clause *quasi... mortem*. We may paraphrase as follows: "though Albinus makes highly subtle distinctions between various kinds of contrasts, the circumstance that death proceeds from life is no sufficient reason why life should likewise arise from death".

30. According to the doctrine of metempsychosis, the number of living people ought to have always remained the same. The possibility of a total annihilation of mankind.

"If the living should indeed arise from the dead, just as the dead proceed from the living, the number of living men ought to have always been the same (§ 1). That this is not the case, is proved by migrations due to over-population, as recorded in Varro's *Antiquitates humanae* (§ 2). Moreover, we can see for ourselves that the population of the earth is steadily increasing: continually new regions are opened up to cultivation and civilisation (§ 3). Still more conclusive evidence may be found in the growing dearth of food, which forces us to regard epidemics, famine, and wars as remedies against over-population. Yet, whenever such a disaster snatched away many men at once, there was no fear that after a thousand years these might return to life all at once (§ 4). Besides, this interim of a thousand years, as assumed by Plato, might have caused a catastrophe: for if a soul should be allowed to re-enter life after so long an interval only, the entire human race might have perished in the meantime! (§ 5)".

The idea that the number of existing souls must be constant is generally found among the adherents of metempsychosis (cf. e. g. Silvestre de Sacy, *La religion des Druzes*, 2 (Paris 1838), 459). In Greece it occurs for the first time in Plato *Resp.* 10, 611 A (it also underlies his exposition in the *Timaeus* (41 D); see W. Stettner, *Seelenwanderung*, 38); it is quite probable, but not so certain as Stettner (p. 8 and 19) thinks, that this idea derives from the Pythagoreans. Concerning the Stoics, Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 21, 3 says: ὁμολογοῦσι δὲ καὶ μετενσωμάτωσιν γίνεσθαι (for this cf. the note on 54, 3, p. 551) ὀρισμένων οὐσῶν τῶν ψυχῶν. Moreover, we may adduce Ovid. *met.* 15 (in the report of the doctrine of Pythagoras (Stettner, 44/5); perhaps this thought is also to be found in Verg. *Aen.* 6, 545: *explebo numerum reddarque tenebris*, but cf. Norden, *Komm.*³, 271/2). Particularly interesting is the application of this argument against the Christians by Sallustius (II. θεῶν καὶ κόσμου 20), and the refutation by Aeneas of Gaza (Stettner, 78/9). Cf. also *Pistis Sophia*, p. 124, 5 seqq. Schwartz,

Aug. civ. dei 12, 20, 3, and Olympiodor. comm. in Plat. Phaed., p. 140, 4 seqq. Norvin.

Tert. makes a very curious use of this argument (which he probably got to know through Albinus; see the Introduction, p. 42*). Such authors as had dealt with this question had only mentioned a constant number of souls without presuming that the number of living men, too, ought always to be the same. Tert. combines this with his treatment of the subject in 29, 1 (where he had introduced the idea of the *initium*); he tacitly assumes that all existing souls entered bodies at the same time, and after this argues: "originally there were only living beings in existence; after a certain time these died, in other words, dead beings proceeded from them, and thereupon living beings arose again from the latter; in this way there always was a genesis from the same number of beings, and on account of this the number of living people must have remained constant: for the people who departed from life on earth could not be more or less numerous than those who came back to it." For the last assertion no proof is furnished, as Tert. deliberately overlooks the fact that Plato assumed an interval between two subsequent incarnations of a soul; for the moment he only sees the connection '*vivi* > *mortui* > *vivi*', for which reason he makes the dead return to life *immediately*. On the other hand, in § 4 he is well-aware of the fact that Plato postulated an interim, and even assumes the possibility of a total disappearance of the human race, which according to his exposition in § 1 is out of the question.

Having thus moulded his materials, it is an easy task for Tert. to confute his adversaries: he need only to point out the increase of the human race. For this he makes use of Varro's *Antiquitates humanae*, of which he had already availed himself for a similar discussion in *de pallio*. This subject leads him to the consideration of the salutary effect of calamities, which in their turn remind him of a possible catastrophe, in case Plato's doctrine about an interval of a thousand years should prove to be true.

1. The contents of this paragraph have already been discussed in the preface. — *qui ex iisdem*: the relative clause has causal force; for *hisdem* (A; here impossible), see Engelbrecht, Ztschr. f. d. österr. Gymn. 41 (1890), 496 and *Unters. z. Claud. Mam.*, 99. — *exissent quam redirent*: for the varying of tenses, see comm. on 2, 2 (of course it should be remembered that the *redire* takes place after the *exire*, though Tert. must have regarded the interval as extremely small).

2. *commentarios . . . antiquitatum*: it is beyond any doubt that these words refer to the famous work of Varro. P. Mirsch, who has collected the fragments (Leipz. Stud. 5 (1882); as to the value of his work, see H. Dahlmann, R. E. Suppl. VI, 1231), overlooked this passage and hence wrongly asserted (p. 64) that Tert. was not acquainted with this book. That Varro discussed migrations of nations is evident from several passages, e. g. Plin. n. h. 3, 8: *in universam Hispaniam*

*M. Varro pervenisse Hiberos et Persas et Phoenicas Celtasque et Poenos tradit; ib. 3, 142; Isidor. Orig. 15, 1, 63 (emigration of the Phocaeans to Gaul; Mirsch, 110); Hier. in Gen. 10, 4 (Mirsch, 35/6). In the present passage Tert. copies pall. 2, 6: Scythae exuberant Persas, Phoenices in Africam eructant, Romanos Phryges pariunt, Chaldaicum semen in Aegyptum educatur, dehinc, cum inde transducitur, Iudaea gens est. Sic et Herculeae posteritas Temeno pariter Peloponnesum occupando producant. Sic et Iones Nelei comites Asiam novis urbibus instruunt (for this passage, cf. Geffcken, Kynika, 96). A similar enumeration occurs in Sen. Consol. ad Helv. 7, 1/2 (two instances are adduced which are also mentioned by Tert.: Athenis in Asia turba est . . . Tyrii Africam incolunt). That the Antiquitates humanae have indeed been used here (or rather in *de pallio*) is the more probable on account of the frequent use made of the *Antiquitates divinae* in the *apologeticum* and in *ad nationes*. — *Aborigines* (B) must be the correct reading (*ab origine* A); a parallel is furnished by Plin. *n. h.* 4, 120 (from Varro *Antiq. hum. lib. 12*: Mirsch, 35/6): *Erythea dicta est, quoniam Tyrii aborigines* (Pintianus; *aborigine* C, *abirigine* A) *earum orti ab Erythro mari jerebantur*. This passage is particularly important, because *Aborigines* here does not denote the original population of Italy, as is mostly the case (cf. Thes. I. L. I: 125, 9 *seqq.*; in the second book of his *Antiq. hum.* Varro wrote '*de Aboriginibus et Latinis*', Mirsch, 33; in most of the places adduced in the Thes. either Cato or Varro was used), but the mother-city of a colony (cf. the similar context in this passage); it is highly probable that Varro used the word in this sense. Of course there is no reason for us to follow La Cerda in separating the *Aborigines* from the *vagi* . . . *quique*, for these *Aborigines* themselves are wandering tribes (a passage such as Sall. *Cat. 6, 1*: *urbem Romam, sicut ego accepi, condidere . . . Troiani qui Aenea duce . . . vagabantur, cumque eis Aborigines* is not to be regarded as a counter-argument, as Sallust discusses the special case of the Italian *Aborigines*); moreover, it is highly improbable that the first *vel* should be applied to connect the *tricolon* with *Aborigines*. So we may assume that Tert. here means *aborigines* who occupy foreign countries, partly being nomads, partly having been exiled, or again from thirst of glory. The only factor in favour of the reading *ab origine* is that it is in perfect accordance with *paulatim*: the number of human beings has steadily increased, and this increase began in the earliest times already (cf. the reference to the *initium* in § 1 and 29, 1); in this case, however we should expect *ab origine prima* or *ab origine humani generis*. On the other hand, it seems possible to retain the reading *origines* (A B; *Aborigines* Ursinus) at the end of the paragraph. *Origo* often has a concrete meaning, viz. a) 'ancestor': Tac. *Germ. 2, 2*: *Mannum, originem gentis conditoremque*; Plin. *n. h. 6, 158*: *Rhadamæi — et horum origo Rhadamantus putatur*; Zeno Veron. 2, 12, 2: *Isaac . . . origo tot regum*; Hilar. *ad Matth. 8, 28*: *duos homines . . . duarum scilicet gentium origines*; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T., qu. 108*; Sedul. *carm. Pasch. 2, 9/10*; b) 'parent race': Tert. *apol. 40, 7*: *nec iam illic (sc. in Palaestina) Christianae sectae origo (= Iudaei) consederat: in**

the plural (as in the passage under discussion) Sall. *Iug.* 19, 1 (the place in other respects, too, resembles the passage under consideration): *eaeque* (viz. the colonies of the Phoenicians in Africa) *brevi multum auctae, pars originibus suis* (their mother-cities) *praesidio, aliae decori fuere*; here *origines* has exactly the same sense as *aborigines* in Plin. *n. h.* 4, 120 (quoted at the beginning of this annotation); cf. also Liv. 26, 13, 16: *Albam, unde ipsi oriundi erant* (sc. Romani), *a fundamentis proruerunt, ne stirps, ne memoria originum suarum exstaret.* — *vagi* refers to the Scythians, *extorres* to the 'Phrygians' (= Trojans) and Phoenicians (Verg. *Aen.* 1, 357; 628/30), *gloriosi* to the *Temenidae* and perhaps also to the Athenians. — *Scythae Parthicas*: Justin. 2, 3, 6: *Parthicum et Bactrianum imperium ipsi* (sc. Scythae) *condiderunt.* — *Temenidae*... *Asiam*: these emigrations are often connected with each other in chronological literature; for instance, Eratosthenes dated the conquest of Troy 80 years after the return of the sons of Heracles and 60 years before the colonization of Ionia (Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1, 21, 138, 1). — *ut Phryges Italiam*: Macrobi. *Sat.* 3, 4, 7: Varro *Humanarum secundo Dardanum refert deos Penates ex Samothrace in Phrygiam, et Aeneam ex Phrygia in Italiam detulisse* (for this passage, cf. Mirsch, 33). — *Athenienses Asiam*: *pall.* 2, 6, Tert. mentions in this context *Iones, Nelei comites*; see v. d. Kolf, art. 'Neleus', R. E. XVI, 2280; Th. Lenschau, art. 'Iones', *ib.* IX, 1871/2. — *amigrationes* (A), though a *ᾱ. λ.*, seems to be the correct reading, for it is to be regarded as a literal translation of ἀποικίαις (for literal translations from the Greek in *de anima*, see the note on 28, 1); the verb *amigrare* too is found once only, viz. Liv. 1, 34, 7: *sublatis itaque rebus* (Lucumo et Tanaquil) *amigrant Romam* (sc. Tarquiniis). — ἀποικίαις (A) must be right, because Tert. regards these migrations as colonizations, as is shown by the next sentence; we may also quote *pall.* 2, 6: (terra) *intellegens alibi stipantem copiam, alibi deserentem, runcare atque ruspere consuluit, ut inde velut ex surculis et propaginibus populi de populis, urbes de urbibus per ubique orbis pangerentur.* — *exonerandae*: Liv. 10, 6, 3: *Romae quoque plebem quietam et exoneratam deducta in colonias multitudo praestabat*; Sen. *Consol. ad Helv.* 7, 4: *alios nimia superfluentis populi frequentia ad exonerandas vires emisit*; Tac. *hist.* 5, 2. — *popularitas* very rarely means 'population' (also *adv. Marc.* 1, 10 = 303, 6). — *examina gentis* has been borrowed from *pall.* 2, 6; *redundantium gentium examina*. Cf. *apol.* 40, 7: *Iudaeorum ab Aegypto examen* (imitated by Hier. in *Gal.* 3, 7); Justin. 25, 2, 8: *ut Asiam omnem velut examine aliquo implerent* (sc. Galli); Ennod. *vit. Epiphan.* (377, 1 Hartel); [Orig.] *tract.* 13 (151, 4 Batiff.); Hier. in *Galat.* 2, praef.; cf. also the note on 23, 4: *examen Valentini*. In all these passages the original sense of the metaphor is still felt, just as in Plato *Leg.* 4, 708 B: οὐ τοίνυν εὐκολος ὁμοίως γίγνεται ἂν ὁ κατοικισμὸς ταῖς πόλεσιν, ὅταν μὴ τὸν τῶν ἐσμῶν γίγνηται τρόπον, ἐν γένος ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἰὸν χώρας οἰκίζηται, φίλον παρὰ φίλων, στενοχωρία τινὶ πολιορκηθὲν γῆς ἢ τισιν ἄλλοις τοιοῦτοις παθήμασιν ἀναγκασθὲν. — *gentilitatem*: cf. 24, 9. — *feneraverunt* = *auxerunt, multiplicaverunt*,

just as *res.* 52 (108, 3): *exurgit* (sc. granum) . . . *copia feneratum*; for more places, cf. *Thes.* I. L. VI: 477, 67/72 (*ib.* 76/7, the verb is interpreted in this passage as 'in usum verterunt'; against this we may refer to *exuberasse* in the preceding sentence and to the purport of the whole passage).

3. *cultior de die*, etc.: here again *de pallio* (2, 7) has been copied: *quantum reformavit orbis saeculum istud! quantum urbium aut produxit aut auxit aut reddidit praesentis imperii triplex virtus! Deo tot Augustis in unum favente quot census transcripti? quot populi repugnati? quot ordines illustrati? quot barbari exclusi? revera orbis cultissimum huius imperii rus est, eradicato omni aconito hostilitatis et cacto et rubo subdolae familiaritatis convulso, et amoenus super Alcinoi pometum et Midae rosetum.* — *de die* = *cotidie* seems to occur for the first time in Tert. (*Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 1043, 32 *seqq.*); also *apol.* 6, 9; *paen.* 12, 2 (*ib.* 10, 1: *de die in diem*); *ad nat.* 1, 7, 18; 1, 10, 4; 1, 16, 17; c. *Chr.* 4, 7. — *silvas arva domuerunt*: a poetical phrase, cf. e. g. Verg. *ge.* 2, 114 *extremis domitum cultoribus orbem*; *Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 1946, 18/31; *Anthol. Lat.* 415, 55; *Ennod. carm.* 1, 9, 135 and *dictio* 8 (447, 15 Hartel). In the present passage and in *de pallio* 2, 7 Tert. imitates official panegyrics, cf. e. g. the speech of a rhetor in honour of Hadrianus (for which cf. W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus*, Leipzig 1907, 89): πόλεις τὲ οὖν δῆπου λάμπουσιν αἴγλη καὶ χάριτι καὶ ἡ γῆ πᾶσα οἶον παρὰ δεισοῦ συγκεκóσμηται (*pall.* 2, 7: *orbis cultissimum huius imperii rus est*); *Paneg.* 11, 15, 4: *ubi silvae fuere iam seges est.* — *pecora* 'domestic animals' (cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 79). — *harenae seruntur*: we must certainly follow A in writing *harenae* (*pall.* 2, 3; for *paen.* 6, 13, cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 61). "Even the impossible is achieved" (cf. Otto, *Sprichw.*, 159, e. g. Ovid *her.* 5, 115: *quid harenae semina mandas?*). — *saxa panguntur*: Wissowa proposes to read *panduntur* and refers to Liv. 21, 37, 3, where we are told how the soldiers of Hannibal *torridam incendio rupem ferro pandunt*. This tempting conjecture is unnecessary, for *pangere* here means 'to plant', cf. Festus p. 213 M.: *pangere figere, unde plantae pangi dicuntur, cum in terram demittuntur*; the same metaphorical use is found in Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 164 (631 C): *legem pangere, gratiam serere*. From Tert. we may adduce the passage just quoted from *de pallio* 2, 6 and *ib.* 3, 6: *tunicam pangere et serere* (= *procreare*, *apol.* 9, 18: *filios pangere vel ex aliqua seminis portione*). Here the soil is the object of the verb, just as in Prop. 3, 17, 15: *ipse seram vites pangamque ex ordine colles*; Colum. 11, 2, 18; Fronto *de fer. Als.* 3, 3. — *eliquantur*: Tert. likes the metaphorical use of this verb: *res.* 6 (34, 13): *deo licuit carnis aurum de limi . . . sordibus . . . eliquasse*; *pall.* 3, 5; *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 (295, 23). — *tantae . . . quantae* = *tot . . . quot*, cf. 9, 6 n. — *nec insulae horrent*: the mention of the islands in this passage may be due to a perhaps subconscious reminiscence of nearly similar enumerations occurring in descriptions of the increasing number of Christians; cf. e. g. *apol.* 1, 7 (*ad nat.* 1, 1, 2): *in agris in castellis in insulis Christianos* (for

more passages, see Lortz, 1, 38₅₄ and 276₁₄₃; cf. also [Hippolyt.] in *Psalm.*, frag. 32 (p. 152 Achelis): καὶ γὰρ ἐκκλησίαι Χριστοῦ τὰς νήσους ἀπάσας πληροῦσιν). — *horrent* is used in the absolute sense of '*horrorem faciunt*', '*displicent*' as in *adv. Marc.* 1, 27 (328, 15): (deo bono) *nullus dentium frendor horret*; it is not certain whether *horrere* has ever been used as a transitive verb (cf. *Thes.* 1. L. VI, 3: 2976, 54/7).

4. *vix . . . sufficiunt*: this sentence may have been suggested to Tert. by the general dearth of food in the time when he was writing *de anima* (cf. *ad Scap.* 3). The present passage was imitated by Hier. *adv. Helvid.* 21: *iam plenus est orbis, terra nos non capit*, and by the author of the *epist. de castit.* 14, 4 (Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigte*, p. 155): *nobis . . . quos iam terra vix sustinet, quibus ipsa iam cum labore, ut ita dixerim, elementa sufficiunt*. — *querellae*: for the orthography, cf. Rönisch, *It²*, 460; Goelz., *Avit.*, 386; Brambach, *Die Neugestaltung der lat. Orthographie* (Leipsic 1868), 258 *seqq.* — *sustinet*: it is impossible to retain the reading of A (*sustineret*); if in the principal sentence the verb is in the present tense, and *dum* has causal force, it is very rarely followed by an imperfect subjunctive (only in texts of the last period of the Latin language; cf. *Thes.* 1. L. V, 1: 2221, 13 *seqq.*); on the other hand, the present indicative in this case is found 21 times in *de an.* (cf. the *Ind. Verborum*, p. 68; it is true that the present subjunctive also occurs frequently: Hoppe, *Synt.*, 79). Moreover, *sustinet* gives a much better clausula; perhaps it is also supported by the passage just quoted from the *ep. de castit.* — *lues . . . civitatum*: there is no reason to follow Fr. Leo in excising *et* before *voragine civitatum*, for in *apol.* 20, 2 disappearances of cities are mentioned besides other disasters: *quod terrae vorant urbes, quod insulas maria fraudant, quod externa atque interna bella dilaniant, quod regnis regna compulsant, quod fames et lues et locales quaeque clades et frequentiae plerumque mortium vastant*. In these enumerations (cf. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 39 (553, 2/4) and *ad nat.* 1, 9, 5) there seems to be a reminiscence of Matth. 24, 7 (Luc. 21, 10/1). Similar descriptions are often given by Christian authors, e. g. Cypr. *de mortal.* 2 (297, 20 H.); *ad Demetr.* 2 (352, 7); Commod. *carm. apol.* 899; Filast. 107, 4; Hier. *ad Ephes.* 1, 7; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 9. — *lues et fames*: the combination λιμός-λοιμός is found throughout Greek literature from Hesiod *Erga* 243 downwards; cf. Blass, § 488, 2; Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, 490₃. — *pro remedio deputanda*: a similar explanation of the Trojan war was already given by Stasinus (*Cypria*, frag. 1 Kinkel): ἦν δ' ὅτε μυρία φύλα κατὰ χθόνα πλαζόμεν' ἀνδρῶν / . . . ἐβάρυνε βαθυστέρνον πλάτος αἰῆς. / Ζεὺς δὲ ἰδὼν ἐλέησε καὶ ἐν πυκιναῖς πραπίδεσσι / σύνθετο κουφίσσαι βάρεος παμβώτορα γαῖαν / ῥιπίσσαι τε πόνου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλιακοῖο, / ὅφρα κενάσειεν θανάτῳ βάρος · οἱ δ' ἐν Τροίῃ / ἥρωες κτείνοντο · Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή (preserved in the *scholia Graeca in Iliad.* ad 1, 5/6 (p. 6, 11 *seqq.* Dindorf); for more details from the scholia, see Kinkel, *loc. cit.*); similarly, Euripides *Helena* 38/40: πόλεμον γὰρ εἰσήνεγκεν (sc. ὁ Ζεὺς) Ἑλλήνων χθονί / καὶ Φρυγί δυστήνοισιν, ὥς ὄχλου βροτῶν / πλήθους τε κουφίσειε μητέρα χθόνα, and *Orestes* 1641/3:

(the Gods caused the Trojan war,) ὡς ἀπαντλοῖεν χθονός / ὕβρισμα θνητῶν ἀφθόνου πληρώματος (see also the scholion on vs. 1641). In the *scholia ad Iliadem* A (Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* IV, 405) the Theban war (which, according to the scholion just quoted, just like the Trojan war, had been recommended to Zeus by Momus 'to relieve the earth'; perhaps a reference to this view may be found in *Odyss.* 14, 235/6 ἐφράσαθ' ~ *Il.* 1, 5 βουλῇ) is quoted together with the Deucalionian deluge which Prometheus is said to have suggested to Zeus. Chrysippus, too, voiced his view about this subject, as is evident from Plut. *de Stoic. repugn.* 32 (1049 A; = *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 1177): 'Ὁ δὲ οὕτω καταγελᾷ τῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐγκαλούντων, ὥστε περὶ τοῦ Διός, τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ γενέτορος καὶ πατρὸς Δίκης καὶ Εὐνομίας καὶ Εἰρήνης ταῦτα γράφειν ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ περὶ Θεῶν · 'Ὡς δὲ αἱ πόλεις πλεονάσασθαι εἰς ἀποικίας ἀπαίρουσι τὰ πλήθη καὶ πολέμους ἐνίστανται πρὸς τινας, οὕτως ὁ θεὸς φθορᾶς ἀρχὰς δίδωσι' καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην μάρτυρα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προσάγεται τοὺς λέγοντας ὡς ὁ Τρωϊκὸς πόλεμος ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀπαντλήσεως χάριν τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένοιτο. In Christian literature we find this view in Arnob. 1, 10: *pestilentias morbos famas atque alias suggerit* (sc. mundus) *malorum exitiabiles formas: unde tibi est scire, ne quod exuberat sic tollat ut per sua dispendia modum rebus luxuriantibus figat?* R. Köhler, *Rh. Mus.* 13 (1858), 316/7, refers to a parallel in an Indian epic (*Harivansa ou histoire de la famille de Hari . . . traduit . . . par M. A. Langlois* (Paris et London 1834), 1, 236 *seqq.*; 387, 410, 418). — *tonsura* is a reminiscence from *de pallio* 2, 6: *si quid mare diluit, caelum deussit, terra subduxit, gladius detotondit.* — *insolescentis*: Rigaltius' conjecture *insolescentis* is superfluous, as is shown by two passages just quoted, viz. Eur. *Orestes* 1642: ὕβρισμα θνητῶν ἀφθόνου πληρώματος, and Arnob. 1, 10: *luxuriantibus rebus*. Moreover, *insolescere* in Tert.'s writings sometimes means 'to expand <shamelessly>': c. *Chr.* 4, 6/7: *uterum de die insolescentem (insolescentem Rig. !)*; *pat.* 2 (3, 4); *ad nat.* 2, 12, 7; cf. also Arnob. 4, 11: *mala ista . . . cotidianis accessionibus insolescant*. Perhaps we should also retain the reading of the manuscripts in *adv. Val.* 39 (212, 5): *insolescentes doctrinae Valentinianorum (insolescentes Latinus and Kroymann)*, though in the sequel we read *in silvas iam exoleverunt Gnosticorum.* — *secures*: Tert. has a special liking for this metaphor, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 194. — *mille annos*: the usual time for the purification during the interval between two subsequent incorporations; e.g. Plato *Resp.* 10, 615 A; *Phaedrus* 249 A; Verg. *Aen.* 6, 748 (see Norden, *Komm.*³, 18/9). — *expavit*: this verb is found with an accus. from Hor. *carm.* 1, 37, 22/3 downwards; from Tert.'s works we may adduce *ad nat.* 1, 7, 15; *scorp.* 12 (172, 18; = 1 Petr. 4, 12); *ad Scap.* 1. *Expavescere ad* occurs in *apol.* 37, 7; 39, 9; *spect.* 17 (19, 10); *orat.* 22 (196, 14/5); *adv. Prax.* 3 (230, 12; Kroymann changes the text adopting a conjecture by Engelbrecht), *expavescere super*, *adv. Marc.* 3, 17 (404, 11 = Esai. 52, 14); cf. Hoppe, *Tert.*, 16₃ and Waltz., *Ét.*, 340.

5. The argument discussed in this paragraph only holds good on the assumption that all existing souls entered bodies at the same

time (see the preface to this chapter). — **et non statim**: as was tacitly assumed in § 1. — **supparetur**: this verb is only used by Tert. (also *iei.* 4 (278,29); *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 1); *adv. Val.* 4 (181, 16); the subst. *supparatura*, *res.* 61 (122, 27), is *ἀ. λ.*). — **erogatum**, not *erogatur*, (*Ursinus*) is the correct reading; for the ellipsis of *esse* in a relative clause, cf. *Lfst., Z. Spr.*, 59. *erogare* = *delere* (from *Val. Max.* 9, 3, 8 downwards) also occurs in 51, 3; *apol.* 48, 14 (*Min. Fel.* 35,3); *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 21); *irr.* Engelbrecht and Kroymann, but cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 131₁); *ad mart.* 4. The meaning 'to kill' is found for the first time in Tert. (*Thes.* 1. L. V, 2: 803, 43 *seqq.*). — **in totum absumi periclitetur**: "there is a danger of total annihilation". Any insertion is unnecessary, as we have an instance here of the impersonal use of the passive infin., just as in 5, 6: *derelicto autem corpore ab anima affici morte*; cf. the note on that passage. — **pariasset**: here the verb has intransitive sense, as in 32, 9; *res.* 53 (111, 17); *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (521, 5; there also followed by a dative). On the other hand, *pariari* occurs in quotations of *Philem.* 2, 6 (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα) in *res.* 6 (33,19) and *adv. Marc.* 5, 20 (647, 24); cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 135. — **commeatus hie vitae**: 'this (= our normal) term of life'; also *scorp.* 10 (165, 30) and *Hegesipp.* 5, 9, 4. *commeatus* = 'space of time' (from *Sen.* downwards: *nat. quaest.* 3, *praef.* 16 and *ep.* 54, 1) is extremely common in Tert. (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 120; Oehler's note on *fuga* 9; Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 617). — **facilis** followed by a passive infin. is found from *Ovid ars* 1, 358 and *Prop.* 4, 8, 40 downwards (*Thes.* 1. L. VI: 60, 50 *seqq.*; for instances from Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 49). — **redaccendi**: Tp (not mentioned in Hoppe's list); also *iei.* 3 (278, 1) and *res.* 12 (41, 3). *reaccendere* is much used by Hier. and Rufin. — **quae**: since the relative clause has causal sense, it is perfectly unnecessary to follow Kroymann in writing *quia*. For the structure of the sentence, a parallel is furnished by *orat.* 22 (193, 23/6): *qui enim alibi distinguere meminit, ubi scilicet differentia postulat . . . ubi non distinguit, . . . nullam vult differentiam intellegi*. — **vivos ex mortuis fieri**: at the end of the chapter the inaccuracy of this statement is emphasized again, just as at the end of ch. 28 and 29.

31. Various arguments against the doctrine of metempsychosis.

"If the living proceed from the dead, there must always arise one single *vivus* from one single *mortuus*, as at birth one soul enters one body; but if this is true, the birth of twins becomes impossible (§ 1). — Why do all souls leaving the bodies at different ages return at the same age, viz. as little children? (§ 2). — According to this doctrine, the souls during the interval change their habits to such a degree that one can never be certain about their identity; e. g. Euphorbus was a great warrior, whereas Pythagoras, his reincarnation, was a quiet vegetarian! (§§ 3/4). — Why do we hear about the reincarnations of Pythagoras only? (§§ 5/6)".

Among the arguments adduced in this chapter only the fourth has some value; to the second a Platonist would have replied that the soul is not subject to the influence of time (that Tert. was acquainted

with this Platonic view, is shown by his own words in 24, 7; his own statements are highly inconsistent, as they are always modified by the context in which they occur: in 38, 1/2 he mentions a 'puberty of the soul', whereas in 56, 5 he says: *aetatem . . . non potest* (sc. anima) *capere sine corpore, quia per corpora operantur aetates*). The third argument does not take account of the Platonic view of a progress or decline of the soul during its subsequent incorporations, which make a change in its habits quite plausible. The first argument contains a sophism: according to the champions of metempsychosis, "a single soul set free from a single body enters a single body" at birth (see the confutation of this view by Lucr. 3, 670 *segg.* and Heinze's note, p. 143/4); however, Tert. asserts that the souls of twins proceed 'from the same womb' (cf. 6, 8), and so by *singulorum corporum singulae animae* in two successive sentences means two different things, viz. "a single soul set free from a single body <of somebody who has died>" and "a single soul proceeding from a single body <of a living woman>".

It stands to reason that the first three arguments, which clearly show Tert.'s usual method of arguing and are found in no other confutation of metempsychosis, do not call for any further search for their sources.

1. *quinae* refers to 6, 8: *Graeca quaedam quinonem enixa*. — *usque* emphasizes the idea of a series: "and so on up to five". Cf. Ph. Thielmann, A. L. L. 5, 447, who in addition to the passage under discussion quotes the following places: Plaut. *Mostell.* 956/8: *heri et nudius tertius, / quartus, quintus, sextus, usque postquam hinc peregrini eius pater / abiit* (it seems advisable to omit the comma after *sextus*); Tert. *mon.* 16: *talis infirmitas et tertio et quarto et usque septimo forsitan matrimonio sufficit*; Cod. Theodos. 6, 24, 11: *ab eodem decem usque numero*; [Cyp.] *de pascha comput.* 23 (268, 22 H.): *usque numerando* 'by counting uninterruptedly'. — *resumuntur* is almost synonymous to *renascuntur*, cf. *res.* 48 (100, 23/4): *iam hic* (1 Cor. 15, 35) *de qualitatibus corporum disserit, an eadem ipsa an alia resumantur*, and comm. on 22, 2: *unde . . . sumatur* (sc. anima). — *signatur*: it is impossible to retain the reading given by A B (*singulatur*), though Lindner tries to save it by interpreting '*singulatur* i. e. singularis fuisse exhibetur'. Linguistically this explanation is not quite impossible (though no other instances of this use of *singulare* are found, as the editors of the Thes. l. l. have kindly informed me): we may compare 2, 2: *privat* = *privos facit* (see the note) and Sedul. *Carm. Paschal.* 1, 298: *simplex* = *simplex (-icem) facere* (cf. the note by Scheps, p. 130); we may also refer to Hom. *Od.* 16, 117 *segg.*: ὧδε γὰρ ἡμετέραν γενεὴν μούνοισε Κρονίων· μούνοιν Λαέρτην Ἀρκείσιος υἱὸν ἔτικτεν, etc. As to the sense, however, the interpretation "primordii forma singularis fuisse exhibetur" is impossible. Tert. asserts that the *forma primordii* ("*o m n e s animae ex u n o Adam*", cf. 20, 6 and 27, 9) is contrary to the *forma metempsychosis*, which would require a genesis of '*s i n g u l i ex s i n g u l i s*'; hence the *forma primordii* is corroborat-

ed by the last words of the preceding sentence, *quia non singuli ex singulis*, and by the subordinate clause (*cum . . . proferuntur*); for this corroboration *signare* is the appropriate term.

2. *discedant* (A B) is certainly right, cf. 56, 5 (*discesserunt* A, de-B Gel). — *imbuuntur* = *initiantur* (sc. *vitae humanae*; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 188, wrongly interprets: “alle werden zuerst im Kindesalter kennen gelernt d. h. alle Geborenen befinden sich im Kindesalter”); the first instances of this use of *imbuiere* are Prop. 4, 10, 5: *imbuis exemplum primae tu, Romule, palmae* (viz. the *spolia opima*), and Ovid *ars* 1, 654: *infelix imbuit auctor* (sc. Perillus) *opus*; cf. Thes. 1. L. VII, 1: 429, 26 *seqq.* From Tert. cf. *pud.* 21 (270, 12): *ipse* (sc. Petrus) *clavem imbuit* (= *primus clave usus est*); *iei.* 5 (279, 4); *adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (421, 2/5): *Iudaeorum . . . dispositio . . . a terrenis bonis imbuita* (= in t. b. *primum monstrata*) *per legem postea ad caelestia . . . deducitur*. It is less probable that we should have to understand *corporibus* and regard *imbuo* followed by a dative as equivalent to *induco, impono* (for this sense, which is unjustly questioned by Ehlers, see Thes. 1. L. VII, 1: 427, 56 *seqq.*; cf. Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 32/3). — *qua infans revertatur*, sc. *anima*: by its entrance into the body of a new-born child the soul itself becomes *infans* (cf. the preface to this chapter). — *retrograda aetate* is almost an *ablat. resultativus*; cf. the note on 19, 5. — *magis erat ut*: for this expression, which occurs from Cic. *pro Caelio* 14 downwards, see Stangl, *Rh. Mus.* 65, 93; *Lfst.*, *Arnob.*, 70/1; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 137; Hofm., *Synt.*, 763. — *progressior*: only one other instance of this comparative seems to exist, viz. *Vulg. Ios.* 23, 2: *progressioris aetatis*. — *coetaneus* as an adj. is very rarely followed by a genit. (also *adv. Hermog.* 6 (132, 23) and *praescr.* 35, 2/3; for the latter passage, however, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 21₂).

3. *revolverentur*: this verb is frequently used in connection with the transmigration of souls, e. g. 32, 2; Aug. *civ. dei* 10, 30 and 18, 41, 2; cf. also *revolubilis* in 28, 2 and *revolutio* in Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 7, 9, 13. — *fatorum . . . sortes*: this conjecture by Kroymann is certainly right; cf. Thes. 1. L. VI: 367, 8/11 and Amm. *Marc.* 14, 11, 19; 31, 16, 8. — *affectionum*: in other similar enumerations Tert. usually writes *affectus*, e. g. 5, 4: *morum et ingeniorum et affectuum*; 24, 4; 31, 4; 32, 8. For the varying of subst. ending in *-us* and *-io*, see comm. on 18, 4 *deceptui*. — *his per quae*: it is certainly wrong to follow Latinus in writing *iis*, as is shown by 35, 3: *ex his quae eierasti* and 57, 4: *et hi vel maxime qui . . .* See the discussion of this question by Ehlers (in Thes. 1. L. VI, 3: 2732, 80 *seqq.*), who sets forth that *hic*, when used as a determinative pronoun, in classical Latin mostly has an emphasizing function (*hic talis*), and that in poetry *hic qui* is often used instead of *is qui* for the sake of metre (since Lucr. 2, 731 and Cic. *Arat.* 235). Apart from these considerations, it should be remembered that in classical Latin already the exclusively determinative use of *hic qui* is more common than is generally assumed. For Caesar, see J. J. E. Hondius in the preface to his new edition of Dr. van Oppen's

C. Juli Caesaris Belli Gallici Libri VII (Groningen-Batavia 1937); numerous instances are found in the works of Seneca and in Plin. *n. h.* From Tert.'s works instances of all three possibilities may be quoted: a) *hic qui* used emphatically: *ad nat.* 2, 5, 8; 2, 17, 1; *adv. Marc.* 4, 28 (517, 12/3); 5, 17 (635, 2/3); b) *hic qui* = *hic talis qui*: e. g. *paen.* 1, 1: *hoc genus homines quod et ipsi retro fuimus*; *apol.* 36, 2; c) *hic qui* quite identical to *is qui*: e. g. *bapt.* 2, 3; 3, 2. In most of the existing monographs these different ways of using *hic qui* are not clearly distinguished. Cf. Stangl, *B Ph W* 28 (1908), 1559 and Woch. kl. Phil. 23 (1906), 1061; Kühn.-Stegm. 1: 621; Hofm., *Synt.*, 475; H. Ziegel, *De is et hic pron. quatenus confusae sint ap. antiquos* (Marburg 1897); Hoogterp, 142/3; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 154; Tidner, *Did.*, 103/4; Grevander, 17; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 310; Linderbauer, 151. — *quia ignotae tibi* (Rig.) is the simplest correction (*ignota et ibi A*). The right explanation has been given by Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 68 (who did not know that A has *quia*, not *qua*, as wrongly reported by Reifferscheid): "they return unrecognizable to you, as this only happens after so long a time". Tert.'s hypothetical opponent is supposed to say: "it is quite possible that the souls should have retained their former qualities, but the long duration of the interim makes it impossible to ascertain this, because one is never able to compare two successive incarnations of the same soul" (a kind of parallel is found in Ephraim, *homilia de Lazaro* 4: "If Christ had resuscitated Seth, Enoch, or Adam, nobody would have known them; therefore he resuscitated Lazarus"); this remark is refuted by a reference to the case of Euphorbus-Pythagoras. — **Pythagoran Euphorbum**: a striking parallel is furnished by Pers. 6, 10/1: *cor iubet hoc Enni, postquam destertuit esse / Maeonides Quintus* ('Homer-Ennius') *pavone ex Pythagoreo* (see my discussion of this much-disputed passage in *Mnemos.*, III. ser., 11 (1942), 68/71). For combinations such as Ἰσὺς Δικαιοσύνη, see Reitzenstein, *Zwei Rel. Fr.*, 105; we may also refer to Hdt. 3, 28: ὁ δὲ Ἄπις οὗτος ὁ Ἐπαφος, to the Gnostic Justin Heracles (*Hippolyt. refut.* 5, 24 *seqq.*), and to the gnostic conceptions Πίστις Σοφία and Ὁρος Σταυρός; for Δημόκριτος-Bώλος, see Wellm., *Bolos*, for Δαμιγέρων-Ἀναξίλαος, *id.*, *Die Stein- und Gemmenbücher der Antike*, 148 (the latter combination is highly improbable).

4. **animam** once more lies midway between ζῷον and 'soul', see comm. on 24, 11. — **clipeorum**: the plural may have been put both *amplitudinis causa* and for the sake of the clausula. — **tune Graeciae**: τῆς τότε Ἑλλάδος, see comm. on 1, 2. — **maluerit quietem**: for the accus., cf. 33, 8; *paen.* 4, 2 (*Ezech.* 33, 11) and 8, 3 (*Hos.* 6, 6); from these instances we must keep separate the pregnant use found in *pall.* 3, 5: *sed vos omnem... structuram... telarum Minervae maluistis*; see Löfst., *Per.*, 211/2 and *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 59₁. — **geometriae... musicae**: cf. *Diog. Laërt.* 4, 2, 10; *Hippolyt. refut.* 1, 2, 2 (*D D G*, 555, 17/8). In Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 2 (219 B) the Pythagorean asks Tryphon: τί δαί; Ὡμίλησας... μουσικῇ καὶ ἀστρονομίᾳ καὶ γεωμετρίᾳ; — **agebat** is equivalent to *vivebat*, *degebat* (see the instances collected

by Harte I, *Patr. Stud.*, 1, 43, e. g. *idol.* 8 (37, 27/8): *si . . . non remediis tam usitatis egerimus*; several places may be added, e. g. *an.* 11, 3; 23, 6; 24, 8; *paen.* 2, 1; 10, 5; *ad nat.* 2, 12, 33). For the abl., cf. comm. on 49, 2; *in* is added in *Cic. pro Rosc. Amer.* 14, 39: *in agro colendo vixerit* (for the omission of *in* before the ablat. of gerund and gerundive, see Lundström, *Eran.* 15 (1915), 201/3). — *ut . . . abstinens*: cf. Arbesmann, *Fasten*, 29/34; for the prohibition to eat fish, see *ib.*, 51 and Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 110 (§ 458). Cf. also *apol.* 48, 1 and Lactant. *div. instit.* 3, 19, 19. — About Aethalides and Hermotimus nothing particular was known, so that Tert. resorts to making some very trivial remarks. — *fabam*: see Arbesmann, 53/4. — *in pabulis communibus* is equivalent to *inter pabula communia* (see comm. on 42, 2): “as one of their usual aliments”. — *inruerat*: the conjectures by Reifferscheid (*invenerat*) and Hartel (*insuerat*) are completely superfluous, *inruere* in this passage being equivalent to *devorare*. For the same meaning of *invadere*, see Rönsch, *It.*³, 372 and *Sem.*, 3, 53 (Lucil., Petron., Apul.; Tert. *pall.* 5, 6 (Vedius Pollio): *servos muraenis invadendos obiectabat*; *ad ux.* 2, 4: *de cibo, de poculo invadere*); we may add Avit. *carm.* 4, 368: *invasus cibus*; *Act. Archelai* 28, 2; Ennod. *Paneg. Theoderic.* (264, 8 H.); *Act. Perpet.* B 9, 3; Petr. Chrysol. *append. serm.* 2 (670 C); Cael. Aurel. *de morb. acut.* 1, 3; Macrob. *Sat.* 7, 5, 24. For *inruere*, see also comm. on 24, 8. — *fabalia* here means ‘seges fabarum’, a meaning found nowhere else (Thes. I. L. VI: 6, 24/6). The words contain an allusion to the well-known story about the death of the Pythagoreans who, when pursued by Eurymenes, refused to cross a field planted with beans (Iamblich. *Vit. Pyth.* 189/91; according to Suidas s. v. Πυθ. and Diog. Laërt. 8, 39, this happened to Pythagoras himself, according to David *proleg.* 11, to Theano).

5. *recuperantur*, i. e. *resumuntur* (see comm. on § 1). — *ingeniis* refers to the contrast between the *bellica anima* of Euphorbus and the *reses anima* of Pythagoras, *institutis* (‘habits’) to Pyrrhus, who was a fisherman, whereas Pyth. refused to eat fish, *victibus* to Aethalides and Hermotimus, who, unlike Pyth., used to eat beans. — *censu* is nearly synonymous to *numero*; see comm. on 8, 1. — *recensentur* = *renascuntur* (note the pun: *censu . . . recensentur*) as in 40, 1; *res.* 1 (26, 1; see my discussion of this passage in *Mnemos.* III ser. 3 (1936), 165); *adv. Marc.* 5, 17 (632, 23; 633, 12); 5, 19 (646, 17); Lactant. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 30/1. For *censeri* in the sense of *nasci*, see the note on 20, 1. — *et ex omni aetate*: there is no reason to follow Gelenius in expunging *et*; see comm. on 27, 1: *concupi et confici, perfici* (moreover, the third part of the sentence contains *denique*). — *aetate . . . sexu*: a very common enumeration, e. g. *ad Scap.* 5: *omnis sexus, omnis aetatis, omnis dignitatis*; *ad nat.* 1, 1, 2; *apol.* 1, 7; *pat.* 15 (22, 27); Min. Fel. 16, 5. For the connection of *aetas* and *dignitas*, cf. Thes. I. L. II: 1132, 55 *seqq.* *omnis sexus* instead of *uterque sexus* is frequently found, e. g. Tac. *ann.* 6, 19; Sen. *Oed.* 53; Suet. *Calig.* 4; Min. Fel. 9, 6; 28, 10; *SH A Vit. Antonini* 18, 5 (*ib.* 12, 10: *utriusque sexus*, see Löfst., *Beitr.*, 107/8); Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 35: *in omni gradu et*

sexu; in *Tit.* 2, 9/10; the 'correct' form, e. g. *Plin. ep.* 10, 96, 9: *multi . . . omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus*; *Petr. Chrysol. serm.* 65 (386 A): *omnes aetates, utrumque sexum*. — *dignitate*, i. e. *ordine*; cf. Borleffs' edition of *ad nat.*, p. 107 (*ad* 1, 1, 2); *Plin., loc. cit.*: *omnis ordinis*; *orat.* 22 (194, 7/8): *quid est omnis mulier, nisi omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, omnis condicionis?* — *metempsychosis . . . metensomatosis*: see the lists drawn up by W. Stettner, *Seelenwanderung*, 5, which show that this passage is one of the first in which *metensomatosis* is found (once in *Clem. Alex.*, five times in *Hippol.*); see also Bickel, *Diatr.*, 116 and 118. We may add *Rufin.-Gregor. Naz. orat.* 9, 10 (275, 15/6 Eng.): *transfundendae per diversas corporum species animae opinionem, quam μετενσωμάτωσιν vocant*. — *non et ego*: the rather abrupt *non et* introduces an antithesis (*Löffst., z. Spr. Tert.*, 66₁).

6. *Aut si* has a similar function as *non et*, cf. *Thörn., Stud. Tert.*, 2, 28/9. — *Seythae*: this refers to Anacharsis, who is also mentioned in *pall.* 5, 1 and *apol.* 1, 8, and is frequently so in the works of Christian apologists (e. g. *Tatian. orat.* 12; *Clem. Alex. strom.* 1, 15, 71, 6 and 1, 16, 77, 3/4; see the note by Staehlin) as a result of the revival of Cynicism in the first century b. Chr. (see R. Heinze, *Philol.* 50, 458 *seqq.*; W. Schmid, art. 'Anacharsis', *R. E. I.*, 2017/8). — *Indi*: viz. the *gymnosophistae*, cf. *apol.* 42, 1: *Brachmanae aut Indorum gymnosophistae*; *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 15). For the estimation of the brahmans by the Cynics (from Onesicritus downwards), see J. Makowsky, *De collatione Alexandri Magni et Dindimi* (thesis Breslau 1919), and the literature quoted by Überweg-Prächter, 64*. In Latin literature the brahmans are mentioned for the first time by Pliny (*n. h.* 7, 22; for further passages, see *Thes. l. L.* VI, 2: 2382, 2 *seqq.*). *Clem. Alex. strom.* 3, 6, 60, 2 mentions them as being adherents of the doctrine of metempsychosis (cf. *ib.* 1, 15, 70, 1). In the present passage the gymnosophists only occur because they were regarded as philosophers (perhaps *Tert.* remembers the passage just quoted from Pliny: *philosophos . . . quos gymnosophistas vocant*). Anacharsis is frequently mentioned together with them (and with other 'barbarian philosophers', especially Zoroaster), e. g. *Claudian Mam. de stat. anim.* 2, 8; *Theodoret. Graec. affect. cur.* 1, 25; *Cyrill. Alex. c. Iulian.* 4 (P. G. 76, 705 B); cf. also *Clem. Alex. strom.* 1, 15, 71, 6/72, 1. — *neminem se retro meminit*: A has *se*, not *et*, as Reifferscheid wrongly reports; hence there is no reason to defend the reading *et* with *Thörn., Stud. Tert.*, 2, 87. No more than in 32, 1: *Empedocles . . . dedignatus aliquem se heroum recordari* an ellipsis of *fuisse* should be assumed. — *Plato* is mentioned at the end of the chapter both *honoris causa* and for the purpose of showing that the attack of ch. 28/31 was directed against him in the first place. — *Nestorem*: *Hom. Il.* 1, 249 (*Otto, Sprichw.*, 242; *Sonny, A. L. L.* 9, 71). — *mella facundiae*: cf. 6, 7: *mulsam aquam de eloquio Platonis*. For this reason it might have been plausible that Plato was *Nestor redivivus*. For this argument, cf. *Lactant. div. instit.* 3, 18, 16: *o miram et singularem Pythagorae memoriam et o miseram oblivionem nostrum omnium qui nesciamus qui ante fuerimus*;

Aug. *de trin.* 12, 15, 24. The mentioning of Plato in this passage is particularly malicious, because, as Tert. had declared ironically (24, 11), *Plato scilicet solus . . . idearum et oblitus et recordatus est*. Besides, the same argument was also advanced by pagan philosophers, as is shown by Olympiodorus *comm. in Phaed.* (p. 211, 1/3 Norvin): Διὰ τί σπάνιοι αἱ κατὰ Πυθαγόραν ἀναμνήσεις, φημι δὲ αἱ τῶν προβιοτῶν; ἢ ὅτι προσδέονται καὶ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ ζώου τοῦ αὐτοῦ μένοντος.

32. *Confutation of the more radical form of this doctrine according to which a human soul may also enter the body of an animal.*

“Empedocles, who in his madness had pretended to be a god, because a hero such as Euphorbus was beneath his dignity, presumed to have once been ‘a shrub and a fish’ (§ 1). It is, however, altogether unimaginable that a human soul should enter the body of an animal, even if such a soul had proceeded from some elementary substance, as is supposed by several philosophers (§ 2), for there are always some kinds of animals which have an aversion from such a substance or to the existence of which it is not essential (§§ 3/4). Moreover, the soul of man is used to a way of living completely different from the life of an animal (§§ 5/6a), and as it is corporeal and possesses the shape and size of a human body, it cannot possibly live in the body of a gnat or an elephant (§ 6b); if all the same it should be able to change in such a degree as to conform to these requirements, it would no longer be the same soul (§ 7). When in Holy Scripture some people are compared to animals, this comparison only refers to some of their qualities, not to their essential being (§§ 8/10)”.

The confutation is composed of five arguments, part of which were certainly invented by Tert. himself, viz. the reference to the size of the soul, which is suggested by his theory on the corporeality of the soul, and the combination of zoological data borrowed from Pliny with doxographical records about the substance of the soul used already in chapter 5. As to the remark that a human soul cannot possibly live the life of an animal, this view is not likely to have existed before Tert., because the advocates of metempsychosis never concerned themselves about the condition of the soul in an animal body (see *comm.* on § 7); accordingly, the digression on the nature of change may also be ascribed to Tert. himself. The last argument may be directed against certain Gnostics (see the note on § 8), though it is also possible that Tert. only discussed Ps. 48, 13 to prevent a false interpretation of this text (for a similar case, see *comm.* on 35, 5).

It is rather surprising that Empedocles is attacked here as the father of this theory (in *apol.* 48, 1 Tert. mentions Pythagoras in this context). This may be due to the doxographical record used by Tert., which may have been similar to Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 3, 3: οὗτος (viz. Empedocles) πάσας εἰς πάντα τὰ ζῶα μεταλλάττειν εἶπε τὰς ψυχὰς · καὶ γὰρ ὁ . . . Πυθαγόρας ἔφη ἑαυτὸν Εὐφορβὸν γεγονέναι. At all events, Tert. deviates from the common tradition of Christian apologetics, which regarded Pythagoras and Plato as the authors of this form of

the doctrine of metempsychosis as well (e. g. Min. Fel. 34, 6/7; Theophil. ad Autolyc. 3, 7; Lactant. div. instit. 3, 19, 19; 7, 12, 30).

A shorter confutation of this same theory occurs in *apol.* 48, 1/4. After a preface in general terms Tert. says (§ 1) that, if it is necessary for the souls to enter bodies again, they must return in *eandem substantiam*, for otherwise *non ipsae sunt, quae fuerant* (§ 2; cf. here § 7); in § 3 any further discussion is declined: *multis etiam locis ex otio opus erit, si velimus ad hanc partem lascivire, quis in quam bestiam reformari videretur*. At the end Tert. argues that the Christian doctrine of resurrection is much more probable (similarly, *ad nat.* 1, 19, 4), just as in *anim.* 33, 11.

1. A ridiculing of the τῦφος of Empedocles, who, in Tert.'s opinion, was hardly more than a lunatic (3,2: *Empedoclis furor*); in *de pall.* 4, 7 he taunts him on account of his silk garment and his copper sandals. In the first and second centuries of our era Empedocles is "the target of philosophic satire" (Geffcken, *Kynika*, 115). Lucianus often turns his actions into ridicule, especially his jumping into mount Etna; for instance, in *dial. mort.* 20, 4 Menippus says to him: κενοδοξία καὶ τῦφος καὶ πολλὴ κόρυζα, ταῦτά σε ἀπηνθράκωσεν αὐταῖς κρηπίσιν οὐκ ἀνάξιον ὄντα (see also *fugit.* 2; *Icaromen.* 13; *vera hist.* 2, 21; Helm, *Lukian und Menipp*, 197₄ and 309₁); cf. also Timon *frag.* 42 Diels; Hor. *ars* 464 *seqq.* (where he copies Bio or Aristo: Gericke, Arch. Gesch. d. Philos. 1892, 212/3). For the apology of Apollonius of Tyana, cf. Geffcken, *op. cit.*, 148, for the ridiculing of metempsychosis in general in the *mimus* (Laberius), Min. Fel. 34, 7; Helm, *op. cit.*, 381; Joh. Schmidt, *Min. Fel. u. Tert.*, 98; Borleffs, *de Tert. et Min. Fel.*, 116. — **quia** (Leopold and Reifferscheid *qui*) is defended by *idcirco* (cf. 6, 5). — **deum**: B 112, 4/5 Diels: χαίρετ' ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῶν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητός / πωλεῦμαι (cf. Wilam., Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1929, 661); *pall.* 4, 7: *Empedoclem . . . qui se caelitem delirarat*; Tatian. *orat.* 3 (4, 3/6 Schwartz): Ἐμπεδοκλέους γὰρ τὸ ἀλαζονικὸν αἶ κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν τοῦ πυρὸς ἀναφυσήσεις ἀπέδειξαν, ὅτι μὴ θεὸς ὢν τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἔλεγεν εἶναι καταψεύδετο. — **delirarat**: just as *somniare* (28, 5), this verb is much used by Christian authors referring to pagan philosophers, e. g. *pall.* 4, 7; Hier. *adv. Pelag.* 1, 19; Lact. *opif. dei* 6, 1 (and still 9 times); Prudent. *Apoth.* 200: *deliramenta Platonis*. It has been borrowed from the polemics of the philosophic schools (e. g. Cic. *Acad. frag.* 20; *nat. deor.* 1, 37, 42, 92, 94; for more instances, see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 466, 5 *seqq.*). — **dedignatus . . . recordari**: "as he thought it beneath his dignity to remember himself (= an earlier existence of himself) as having been one of the demigods". *Se* is the object of *recordari* (cf. 31, 6: *cur neminem se retro meminit Epicurus?*); hence it is wrong to adduce this passage as an instance of the use of *dedignari* with an *accus. c. inf.*, as is done in Thes. l. L. V, 1: 263, 15/7. — **thamnus et piseis fui**: B 117 Diels: Ἦδη γὰρ ποτ' ἐγὼ γενόμεν κοῦρός τε κόρη τε / θάμνος τ' οἰωνός τε καὶ ἔξαλος ἔλλοπος ἰχθύς. This verse is often quoted in doxographical literature, e. g. Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 3, 2. Hermias *Irrisio* 4 (*D DG* 652, 17/8) makes the soul

say: ἔτι δὲ ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ θάμνον με ποιεῖ (*ib.*, l. 12 he mentions the fish); cf. also Gregor. Nyss. *de anim. et resurr.* 231 B (p. 102 Krabinger): ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ μέχρι τῶν θάμνων τὸν τοιοῦτον λῆρον ἐκτείνουσιν. Chalcid. *comm.* 195 Müll. gives this translation: *namque ego iamdudum vixi puer, et solida arbos / et tali sexu inde animal, tum lactea virgo.* — **magis** = *potius*, cf. 29, 1 n. — **pepo** ‘pumpkin’ and ‘blockhead’. Petron. 39, 12: *in aquario (nascuntur) copones et cucurbitae*; Apul. *met.* 1, 15: *nos cucurbitae caput non habemus*. For more instances, see Weinreich, *Senecas Apocolocyntosis* (Berlin 1923), 11/2; Helm, *B Ph W* 33 (1913), 1487 (parallels from the English), Th. Rasi, *ib.* 1661/2 (ital. zucca, zuccone); H. Mrose, *ib.* 34 (1914), 383; Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, 73₁ and 378; Otto, *Sprichw.*, 100; Sonny, *A. L. L.* 9, 58/9; Bickel, *Philol.* 77 (1921), 220; B. Schmidt, *Rh. Mus.* 33 (1878), 637/8; Th. Birt, *ib.* 46 (1891), 152/3. Cf. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (560, 6): *peponem quem Marcion cordis loco habuit*; Iren. 1, 5, 2: *Hae virtutes, cucurbita, et perinane, et cucumis, et pepo, emiserunt reliquam multitudinem Valentini deliriosorum peponum*; *ib.* § 3: *o pepones, sophistae vituperabiles et non viri* (Harvey supposes that the Greek text contained a parody of *Odyss.* 2, 235, e. g. ὦ πέπονές ῥα, σοφισταὶ ἐλεγκτοί, μηδὲ τ’ ἀλθηεῖς). — **chamaeleon, tam inflatus**: cf. *pall.* 3, 3: (cham.) *oscitans vescitur, follicans ruminat, de vento cibis*, following Plin. *n. h.* 8, 122 (cf. *ib.* 11, 188): *ipse celsus hianti semper ore solus animalium nec potu alitur nec alio quam aeris alimento*. For more details, see Wellmann, art. ‘Chamäleon’, *R. E.* III, 2104/6. — **sepultura conditiore putesceret**: this very simple conjecture by Ursinus (*conditio reputesceret* A) seems to restore the original reading. A striking parallel is furnished by *res.* 32 (71, 2/7): *puto autem huius quoque divinae potestatis documentum idoneum Ionam, cum incorruptus utramque substantiam, carnem atque animam, de alvo piscis involvitur — et utique triduo concoquendae carni < tam > viscera ceti suffecissent quam capulum, quam sepulcrum, quam senium requietae atque conditae alicuius sepulturae* (Kroymann: ‘a condiendi verbo scilicet’): the “peaceful and tidy grave” is opposed to the belly of the fish, just as in the present passage the *sepultura conditior* contrasts with the cremation (*assum se maluit*), from which Tert. has a great aversion (see the note on 33, 5: *Inde in ignem datur* (sc. homicida), *ut et sepultura puniatur*). If we follow A B, we must firstly assume a *ἀ. λ. reputescere*, and secondly suppose that *conditio* may mean ‘body’ (for the concrete sense of *conditio*, see the note on 9, 8); finally, the clausula would deteriorate (now 2 γ, in the other case 2 β, which is a rare form; moreover, the ending -o of the nomin. of the third declension is mostly regarded as short; cf. e. g. Hagendahl, *Prose métr. d’Arnobé, passim*). *sepultura* = *sepulcrum* also occurs in *apol.* 37, 2; *res.* 12 (41, 1/2); 48 (99, 18); 57 (117, 9/10); for more instances, see J. E. Church, *A. L. L.* 13, 427/8; Sjögren, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 140/1. For another concrete meaning (= *sepultus*), cf. the note on 51, 2. As an adjective *conditus* is found from Cic. downwards (*Thes. l. L.* IV: 143, 54/61). — **assum**: a vulgar word (Hunger, 12) here used contemptuously; it may, however, also produce the opposite effect: Petr. *Chrysol. serm.* 135 (566 B): *torrenda*

et, ut verius dicam, assanda martyrio nobilis illa Laurentii craticula (cf. Ekkehart *lib. bened.* 4, 31, 90: *piscis et hic assus: Laurentius est ita passus*); still more remarkable is Aug. *tract. in evang. Ioh.* 123, 2: *piscis assus* (∞ Luc. 24, 42) *Christus est passus* (the last two passages are mentioned by Weyman, *Christl.-Lat. Poesie*, 237). — in *Aetnam praecipitando*: cf. the note on the beginning of this paragraph. In *apol.* 50, 5 this jump is mentioned as an example of disregarding death, which is however surpassed by the courage of the Christians; cf. also *mart.* 4. — *ut aestiva cena post assum*: I have found no other passages where this custom is mentioned.

2. For *praesumptionem*, see 1, 3, for *revolventem*, the note on 28, 2. — *licebit et lapathi*: in Mnemos. III ser., 9 (1940), 129/30, I have defended this reading by referring to Colum. 10, 373: *lubrica iam lapathus, iam thamni sponte virescunt*. Tert. plays upon the double meaning of *thamnus* (for similar puns, see the note on *divinior*, 28, 1): a) 'bush' in general (the sense found in the verse of Empedocles); b) a certain plant (*Tamus communis* L, for which cf. Engler-Prantl, *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien*² II 5, p. 136; Hedfors, 122) mentioned by Plin. *n. h.* 21, 86: *in Italia paucissimas* (sc. *herbas sponte nascentes*) *novimus fraga, tamnum*, and Apic. 4, 127, which, just like the sorrel, was eaten as a vegetable. It seems hardly possible to retain the reading of A, *lapti*, as a vulgar form of *lapathi*, as for this we already find *lappa* (Acro ad Hor. *epod.* 2, 57), *lappa*, and *lap(p)acium* (C G L II: 585, 16; cf. Heraeus, Rh. Mus. 58 (1903), 464). A joke of this kind might have been found in the *diatribe* of the Cynics; cf. Varro *Eumenid.* XXXXVII (*Sat. Menipp.* frag. 163 Bücheler): *Empedocles natos homines ex terra ait ut blitum* (= 'spinach'). We may also compare a fragment of the comedian Epicrates (Fragm. Com. Att., 2, 287 Kock), who says that the Platonists, passing their time in classifying the different domains of nature, διαχωρίζειν ζῴων τε βίον / δένδρων τε φύσιν λαχάων τε γένη. For the ellipsis after *licet*, cf. adv. Herm. 36 (166, 16/7): *sed de motu et alibi licebit*; for the use of *licebit* instead of *licet*, see the note on 20, 2. — *ridere*: on the other hand, in adv. Val. 6 (183, 9) jokes are considered of importance for the purpose of confutation: *si et ridebitur alicubi, materiis ipsis satisfiet*. — *elementiciis*: á. λ.

3. *Sive enim ignis . . . sive spiritus*: cf. the enumeration in 5, 2; *aer . . . lumen*: 9, 5. — *eolubros*: Verg. *ecl.* 3, 93 *frigidus . . . anguis* (Thes. I. L. II: 52, 42/5); Lucan. 6, 488; Dracont. *de laud. dei* 3, 305: *serpentum glacies*. Most of these zoological notes have been borrowed from Plin. *n. h.* — *stelliones*: Plin. *n. h.* 11, 90/1. — *salamandras*: Plin. 10, 188: *huic tantus rigor ut ignem tactu restinguat non alio modo quam glacies*. This popular belief is mentioned for the first time by Arist. *hist. anim.* 5, 19 (552 b 17); see Wellmann, *Physiolog.*, 74 and Abh. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl. 1928, 7: 21/2. — For *etiam* at the end of an enumeration (from Cic. *Verr.* II 4: 62 downwards), cf. Thes. I. L. V, 2: 935, 76 *seqq.*; Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 3, 15/7; Lögdberg, 9; it often occurs in the writings of Varro, e. g. l. l. 9, 12: *Miconos*,

Dioris, Arimmae, etiam superiorum; de re rust. 1, 47; 3, 12, 1 (Reiter, 9/10). — **prodeuntur**: for the use of the future, see the note on 10, 6. — **exsuccida**: ἄ. λ.; as to the orthography, cf. the note on 5,5. — **siccitatibus**: the plural is used to denote continual drought, as in Varro *de re rust.* 1, 31, 5; 1, 36, 1; Caes. *bell. Gall.* 5, 24, 1; cf. Lfst., *Synt.*, 1, 31. — **aquae** (Junius) is certainly right (*atque* (A B) instead of *aquae* is often found in manuscripts, cf. e. g. the *apparatus* on Varro *de re rust.* 1, 63; Liv. 24, 9, 6; Justin. 36, 3, 6). — **lucustae**: Plin. *n. h.* 9, 95: *locustae crusta fragili muniuntur in eo genere quod caret sanguine*. — **papiliunculi**: ἄ. λ. **chamaeleontes**: see the note on § 1. — **cochleas**: the tragic poet quoted by Cic. *divin.* 2, 133 calls the snail *sanguine cassam*. — **censum**: 'class, group'; Tert. here certainly follows Plin. *n. h.* 9, 83: *piscium sanguine carent de quibus dicemus*. — **quae spirare non videntur**: cf. 10, 5/6 n. — **minutalia** (from Petron. 47, 5 downwards) also occurs *cult. fem.* 1, 6, 1, the adjective *-is adv.* Marc. 1, 4 (295, 20). — **subterraneum . . . viventia**: it is unnecessary to follow Gomperz in writing *subterraneo*; cf. e. g. *exh. cast.* 6: *innumerum nubere*; *scorp.* 12 (173, 25): *martyrum animae . . . placidum quiescunt*; for more instances, cf. Hoppe, *Tert.*, 10/2; Müller, *Nom. und Akk.*, 81 *seqq.*; Bernhard, 107. *subaquaneus* is Tp. — **res . . . noveris**: cf. Plin. *n. h.* 11, 2: *ubi tot sensus collocavit (natura) in culice? — et sunt alia dictu minora*; Hier. *ep.* 60, 12, 1 (quoted in comm. on 10, 6). — **talpas**: Plin. 11, 139: *quadripedum talpis visus non est*. — **vesperugines** only here means *vespertiliones* (the usual sense is 'evening-star': Plaut. *Amphitr.* 275; Censorin. 24, 4). — **noctuas**: cf. 8, 4.

4. **atomos . . . entelechias**: the Epicurean atoms, though also contained in the enumeration given in 5, 2, had not been mentioned in § 3, where there was no need for them; here this omission is rectified and a new list added. This list may have been borrowed from similar enumerations found in treatises of the Sceptics, e. g. Sext. *Empir. Pyrrh. hypot.* 3, 152; probably the same source is to be assumed for such passages as Philo *de somn.* 1, 30: τί γάρ αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν νοῦν) οἰόμεθα κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι; πνεῦμα ἢ αἷμα ἢ σῶμα συνόλως . . . ἢ πέρας ἢ εἶδος ἢ ἀριθμὸν ἢ ἐνδελέχειαν ἢ ἀρμονίαν ἢ τί τῶν ὄντων; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 12, 81, 5: πῶς γάρ ἂν εἴη ῥητὸν δὲ μήτε γένος ἐστὶ μήτε διαφορὰ μήτε εἶδος μήτε ἄτομον μήτε ἀριθμός; cf. also Dionys. Alexandr. *ap. Euseb. praepar. evang.* 14, 24 (774 C): ὁράτωσαν γὰρ τὰς ἀθεάτους (sc. ἀτόμους) ἐκεῖνοι, καὶ τὰς ἀνοήτους νοεῖτωσαν. Perhaps this passage was copied by Fulgentius (cf. the notes on 6, 7 and 46, 10) *Virg. contin.* (85, 19 *seqq.* Helm): *nam non illa in tuis operibus quaerimus, in quibus aut Pitagoras modulos aut Eraclitus ignes aut Plato ideas aut Hermes astra aut Crisippus numeros aut endelechias Aristoteles in-versat*. — **entelechias**: Cic. still writes this word in Greek characters (*Tusc.* 1, 22); Tert. is the first to use it as a Latin word. — **speciebus**: this form, which was rejected by Cic. (*top.* 30), also occurs *adv. Prax.* 6 (235, 12). — **reformari**: not = *formari*, as Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 104₃, wrongly supposes; it is equivalent to *renasci* and *recenseri*, just as in *apol.* 48, 3: *in . . . bestiam reformari*; *ad nat.* 1, 4, 12: *in melius reformari*

(i. e. through the true faith, cf. *Cypr. ep.* 74, 5 (803, 8 H.): *in novum hominem spiritaliter reformatus*). — *translatione* lies midway between 'transfer' and 'alteration' (the latter sense occurs in *It. Sap.* 7, 18: *temporum varietates et -nes*, LXX: μεταβολάς, *Vulg.*: *commutationes*), just as in *adv. Herm.* 39 (169, 1/2). — *haberet* = *deberet*, followed by a pass. infin., as in 35, 1 (in 55, 2 it precedes an act. infin.); for more instances from Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 44. The best discussion of this subject is given by Ph. Thielmann, *A. L. L.* 2, 64 *seqq.* and 157 *seqq.* (especially 170 *seq.*); cf. also Rönsch, *It.*², 447/9; *Lfst.*, *Synt.*, 2, 65 *seqq.*; *Salon.*, *Vit. Patr.*, 282 *seqq.*; Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 196 *seq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 558; Mörland, 144/5; Blatt, 42; Tidn., *Did.*, 190; Baehrens, *Glotta* 4 (1913), 279; Bendz, *Texkrit. und interpret. Bemerk. zu den frontinschen Strategemata*, 12/3 and *Echtheitsfrage*, 173/4. In Tert.'s writings and in the *Itala*, *habeo* is mostly (in the *Vitae Patrum* always) put before the active and after the passive infin. Thielmann is wrong in asserting that in Tert. *habebam amari* is equivalent to *amari poteram*, *amari habebam* to *amari debebam*; cf. e. g. *adv. Herm.* 21: *illud in totum habebat* (= *debebat*) *intellegi*. According to this same scholar, both meanings occur for the first time in Tert.; we may, however, perhaps interpret *habet* as *debet* in Val. Flacc. 1, 671/2; cf. Bendz, *op. cit.*, 174. — *committit*: 'brings about'; the same meaning occurs in *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (389, 11/2): *lucis . . . et tenebrarum . . . commisit communicationem*; *ib.* 3, 24 (420, 10); *res.* 47 (96, 28); 52 (108, 23); *scorp.* 2 (149, 27); 6 (156, 16) (*Thes. l. L.* III: 1909, 26 *seqq.*; also *adv. Marc.* 1, 19 = 314, 27). Apart from some common expressions such as *ludos*, *aciem*, *proelium committere*, this meaning is rarely found; probably we must assume some influence of law terms (cf. e. g. Papin. *dig.* 46, 8, 3 *pr.*: *stipulationem committi*; Cels. *ib.* 4, 8, 37: *poenam committet*; Liv. 9, 11, 10: *sponsione commissa*).

5. *viectus et instructus*: see the note on 17, 11. — *sensus et affectus*: this combination is found five times in Tert.'s writings; moreover, in *adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (425, 18) we find *sensibus et adfectionibus*. — A similar discussion occurs in Ambros. *de excessu frat. Satyri* 2, 127.

6. *sublimitatis*: cf. 9, 1 n. — The genit. after *intrepidus* may be due to the analogy of *securus* (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 23). — *fatigabilis, strangu-labilis, submersu*: ἀ. λ. — *aeri . . . insultabit*: the dative is due to rhyme (≈ *mari*; certainly not a *dat. finalis*, as Kok, 125, supposes). *in aquila*: like Agamemnon, Plato *Resp.* 10, 620 B. According to the Κόρη χόσμου (Stob. *ecl.* 1, 398 Wachsmuth; p. 480 Scott), the souls of the βασιλεύοντες enter the bodies of lions and eagles. The choice of *anguilla* is of course only due to rhyme (≈ *aquila*). *Desultabit* (also 34, 3) is Tp. — *non dico* (or *dicam*) . . . *sed* (from Cic. downwards) is often found in Tert.; cf. Thierry, 185. — *pabulis liberalibus*: *Apul. met.* 10, 15 (248, 7 H.): *liberalibus cenis*. — *agrestes amaritudines frondium*: a most artificial expression; *amaritudines frondium* = *amarae frondes*. For a genit. used in this way Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 86, have proposed the term *genitivus inversus*; for instances from poets,

see Juret, *Synt.*², 309 (Hofm., *Synt.*, 395, omits to discuss this use of the genit.). Added to this comes the enallage of the adjective. For *amaritudo* = *res amara*, see Svenn., *Pallad.*, 518. — *bestias sterquiliniorum*: Reifferscheid puts a comma before *vermium*, lest we should be forced to read *bestias sterquiliniorum vermium*. This punctuation, however, is impossible, as the subsequent words *si . . . coturnicem* only permit us to think of poison without any further qualification; Tert. certainly has in mind Plin. *n. h.* 10, 197: *venenis caprae et coturnices . . . pinguescunt* (cf. also Lucr. 4, 640/1: *praeterea nobis veratrum est acre venenum, / at capris adipēs et coturnicibus auget*; *ib.* 5, 899/900; Serv. *ad Aen.* 4, 486; as to the goat, cf. Hesych. s. v. ἐλλέβορος and Diog. Laërt. 9, 80, as to the quail, Plin. *n. h.* 10, 69; Sext. Empir. *Pyrrh. hypot.* 1, 57; Ambros. *hex.* 3, 9, 39; Eustath. *Basil. hex.* 5, 4 = 915 C). If, on the other hand, we do read *bestias sterquiliniorum vermium*, *sterquiliniorum* must either be interpreted as an adjective (which, as the editors of the Thes. l. L. inform me, is found nowhere; moreover, the subst. is used twice by Tert. in a quotation from Holy Scripture (Ps. 112, 7): *adv. Marc.* 4, 28 (519, 13) and 4, 34 = 538, 21) or we are forced to make a most unnatural interpretation: “beasts of dunghill worms” (*genit. definitivus*, like *monstrum hominis*). *Bestiae vermium* (which receives no support from parallelism with *amaritudines frondium*) is a very singular expression and may not be put on a level with such cases as *animalia volantum* or *natantum* (for which see my note on *carm. de resurr.* 69, p. 59/60), where the genit. denotes a bigger class of animals; moreover, such genitives are never found after *bestiae*. From these considerations we may draw the conclusion that the text is corrupt. Perhaps we should read *verum* instead of *vermium* (*verum etiam*: 28, 2; *paen.* 3, 13, etc.); it seems, however, also probable that *vermium* is to be regarded as a marginal note which passed into the text: some reader may have written the word *vermes* in the margin to explain *bestias sterquiliniorum*; next *vermes* may have been inserted into the text: *bestias sterquiliniorum vermes*, after which it was changed into *vermium* after *sterquiliniorum*. In this case *etiam* is put at the end of the enumeration just as in § 3: *colubros, stelliones, salamandras, etiam quaecumque de aemulo producentur elemento*; cf. the note on that passage and especially *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 3: *iidem angeli, qui et materias eiusmodi et inlecebras detexerunt, auri dico et lapidum inlustrum, et operas eorum tradiderunt, etiam ipsum calliblepharum vellerumque tincturas inter cetera docuerunt. — cadaverinam*: Tp. For the ellipsis of *carnem* (similarly, *verbecina*, *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 = 559, 7), cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 43, and Löfstedt, *Synt.*, 2, 238/9. — *leone*: like Aias, Plato *Resp.* 10, 620 B (it is hardly probable that Tert. should have this passage in mind here). According to Empedocles B 127 Diels, this is the best μετενσωμάτωσις; for a similar view occurring in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, see the note on *aquila* in this very paragraph. The mention of the bear may be due to the fact that bears and lions are often mentioned in one breath in descriptions of persecutions, e. g. *iei.* 17 (297, 25/6). — *Sic . . . rediges* (B) is the correct reading, cf. *adv. Prax.* 11 (245, 4): *sic et*

cetera . . . — *Ne . . . immoremur*: cf. e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 15 (355, 7): *ac ne pluribus inmoremur*, . . . ; *pat.* 5 (9,25): *ac ne singula pervagemur*: . . . — *Necesse . . . obduci*: this follows from 9, 7/8; a similar confutation of idolatry is given by Arnob. 6, 18.

7. *adaequantia*, sc. *ei* (see the note on 8,1). — *secundum qualitates generum*: the advocates of metempsychosis never state clearly whether a human soul after entering the body of an animal remains unchanged or merges into the soul of that animal; it is, however, more than probable that generally the former view (which lies at the root of §§ 3/6; cf. § 6: *sui utique memor*) was adhered to, firstly, because the μετεσώματωσις was commonly regarded as a retribution, secondly, because in descriptions of metamorphoses this view is rather frequently expressed, e. g. Hom. *Odyss.* 10, 240: αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἐμπεδος ὥς τὸ πάρος περ; Ovid. *met.* 2, 485; 4,602, etc.; cf. also St. V. F. 2, frag. 762. — *numquid* occurs in direct questions from Plautus downwards, in indirect questions from Terence downwards (Hofm., *Synt.*, 649). In *de anima numquid* is found twice, *num* 5 times (*num ergo* 3 times); *de paen.* 0: 2 (once *num ergo*), *de bapt.* 2: 0, *ad nat.* 4: 0, *de fuga* 2: 0. For more details, see Tidn., *Did.*, 20; Goelz., *Avit.*, 685; Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 57 (1929), 49; Hofm., *Umgangsspr.*, 42, 162. — *si demutationem capit amittens quod fuit*: a very common definition of change since Aristotle (e. g. *phys.* 191a 6/8; cf. also Melissus B 8, 6 Diels; see H. Meyer, *Die Lehre von den Keimkräften* (Bonn 1914), 186). It is found very often in Tert.'s writings, e. g. *apol.* 48, 2 (in the same context): *iam non ipsae sunt* (sc. *animae revolutae in corpora bestiarum*) *quae fuerant, quia non potuerunt esse, quod non erant, nisi desinant esse quod fuerant*; *adv. Prax.* 27 (281, 1/2): *omne enim, quodcumque transfiguratur in aliud, desinit esse quod fuerat et incipit esse quod non erat*; *adv. Herm.* 12 (139, 16/8); 34 (163, 17/8); c. *Chr.* 3, 21/2; 13, 10; *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (292, 3/4); 2, 5 (340, 1); *res.* 55 (113, 25: about the difference between *perditio* and *mutatio*). In patristic literature it is extremely common, e. g. Cypr. *de zelo et liv.* 15 (429, 14 H.); Novatian. *de trin.* 4; Aug. *serm.* 7, 7 and *confess.* 12, 6, 6; Leporius *ap.* Cassian. c. *Nestor.* 1, 5, 4; Cassian. *ib.* 6, 10, 6; Hilar. *comm. in Matth.* 31, 2; Hier. *ad Ephes.* 1, 1; Optat. *Milev.* 5, 7 (134, 7/8 Ziwsa); [Potam.] *de Lazaro* (P. L. 8, 1412 A); Method. *de resurr.* 1, 48, 2 and 3, 6, 8; Firm. *Mat. err. prof. relig.* 5, 4 (14, 2 *seqq.* Ziegler; for this passage, cf. Skutsch, *Kl. Schr.*, 434₂); Prudent. *psychom.* 82/3. We must start from these premises to understand the formulation of the conception commonly found since the fourth century that by his incarnation Christ *erat quod nos sumus, neque amiserat esse quod manserat* (Hilar. *de trin.* 11, 16); cf. also Ambrst. *in 2 Cor.* 5, 22: *sicut qui fit praefectus, non amittit quod erat, sed assumit utique quod non erat*. The same conception underlies the reading of the *Vulg.* in *apol.* 35, 2: *civitatem tabernae habitu abolefacere* (F: *demutare*). Before Tert. this idea was expressed most explicitly in Latin literature in the words of Lucr. (3, 519/20): *nam quodcumque suis mutatum finibus exit, / continuo hoc mors est illius quod fuit ante* (as to Epicurus, see Heinze's note *ad loc.*,

p. 128). For the circumstantiality of the argument, cf. Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 135/6. — *dicetur . . . pateretur*: for more instances of the *variatio temporum*, cf. Thörnell, *Eran.* 16 (1916), 116.

8. *ipsa* (instead of *eadem*) underlines the identity (cf. the note on 10, 9). — *Nam etsi* etc.: Ps. 48, 13 (21) is often discussed in patristic literature; Iren. 5, 8, 2 interprets this passage in exactly the same way as Tert. (however, without referring to metempsychosis; cf. also 4, 7 and 4, 68, 1); according to Clem. Alex. *strom.* 3, 17, 102, 3, it was used by Valentinus as an argument for the existence of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* (cf. also *ib.* 4, 3, 12, 4). It played a part in the confutation of the transmigration of souls, as is shown by Filastr. 124: *alia est heresis quae dicit animas venenariorum, sceleratorum et homicidarum et aliorum talium transire in daemones ac pecudes et bestias et serpentes; . . . animae itaque natura non vertitur in naturam alteram, sed, cum voluntate contemnit ac negligit dei praeceptum studiisque legitimis et salutaribus inherere dissimulat futuro iudicio poenarum se dedicans, non aliis morum causa nisi pecudibus cognoscitur comparanda, non natura, sed moribus, ut scriptum est. Non ergo naturae pecudum, sed moribus in hoc saeculo similes efficiuntur huiusmodi homines*. Augustine, too, discusses this text in connection with the doctrine of metempsychosis (*de gen. ad litt.* 7, 9, 13/5; in § 14 he remarks: *homo . . . comparatus est iumentis insensatis . . . sed in hac vita utique, non post mortem*); see also Bauer's note on Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 4, 1 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 267). — *inrationalibus* is also found in a quotation of the same text in *scorp.* 10 (166, 11); hence Pamelius is certainly wrong in writing *irrationabilibus* (yet this occurs in *res.* 52 = 108, 19). — *milvi . . . pudicis*: this way of connecting special characters with special kinds of animals is found in discussions of the migration of souls from Plato *Phaedo* 81 E *seqq.* downwards (from which passage the mention of the *milvi* in this place derives). Cf. *Resp.* 10, 620 A/D and *Tim.* 42 B/C (copied by [Tim. Locr.] Π. ψυχ. κοσμ. 104 D/E); Plut. *de sera num. vind.* 567 E *seqq.*; Plotin. 4, 3, 12; *Herm. Trismeg., exc.* 26, 6; Chalcid. *comm.* 198; Claudian. *carm.* 5, 483/4; Boëth. *consol. philos.* 4, 3; from Christian literature we may adduce Ambros. *de bono mort.* 10, 45; Aug. *de gen. ad litt.* 7, 9, 15; [Justin.] *Quaest. gentil. ad Christ.* 11 (15), 20/1 (III 2, p. 359 Otto). This view was combated by Porphyrius, Jamblichus, and Hierocles (*de provid. et fato*, p. 250 Needham; for more details, see Rohde, *Psyche* 2, 276₄; Stettner, 72/6; Cumont, *Afterlife*, 184), as these philosophers, according to Aen. Gaz. *Theophr.* P. G. 85, 893 A, οὐκ εἰς ὄνον φασίν, ἀλλ' ὀνάδῃ ζῆνθρωπον ἀναβιῶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, . . . οὐ γὰρ τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων μορφήν μεταμπίσχεσθαι (cf. also Olympiod. *comm. in Phaed.* p. 166, 29 *seqq.* Norvin). For the opinion of Syrianus and Proclus, which lies midway between these two views, see Stettner, 80/1 (we may add Aen. Gaz., *op. cit.* 896 C: τὸν . . . ἰκτῖνον λέγουσι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἔχειν τὴν ἄλογον, τὴν δὲ ἀνθρωπεῖαν ταύτῃ συνδεδέσθαι, καὶ παραμένειν καὶ συμπέτεσθαι. — *milvi ex rapacibus*: as already observed, this first example derives from Plato; the rest was,

of course, added by Tert. himself. As to the rapacity of the harrier, see Otto, *Sprichw.*, 222/3; Weyman, A. L. L. 8, 406. — *oves ex probis*: Otto, 261. — *hirundines ex garrulis*: cf. Verg. *georg.* 4, 307; *eleg. in Maecen.* 1, 101/2. — *columbae ex pudicis*: *mon.* 8; Plin. *n. h.* 10, 104; Porph. *ad Hor. epod.* 16, 32. — *quasi eadem . . . repetat*: "as if the same substance of the soul would repeat (= anew give expression to) its natural qualities everywhere in the properties of certain animals". In the next sentence a distinction is made between *substantia* and *natura* for the purpose of preserving the identity of the *substantia animae humanae*, whereas it is granted that man and animal may have the same *natura*; here, however, *natura* is still almost equivalent to *status* (for which see the note on 4). As to this distinction of *substantia* and *natura*, cf. the note on 9,6.

9. *communicat*: for the intransitive sense, cf. the use in 18,2. — *pariant*: cf. 30, 5. — *si . . . sed* (also 33, 8; 51, 7; 53, 5; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 108 and *Beitr.*, 127): a Grecism which is found from the *Itala* and Tert. downwards; for instances from a later period, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 666; Linderbauer, 309; Lfst., *Per.*, 203. — *Ipsum* (the reading of A: *ipsud*, for which cf. Neue-Wagener, 2, 408; 4, 190; Rönsch, *It.*, 276; Haag, 884; Tidn., *Did.*, 53, is impossible in Tert.) . . . *quod* = *ipso quod*. This expression was explained for the first time by Thörnell (*Strena Upsal.*, 387), who starts from *paneg.* 9, 3, 1: *ut hoc ipsum quod vel uno die atque una de re in foro dicam veniam magis possim sperare quam gloriam* (*hoc ipso* the older editions, *ob hoc ipsum* Aem. Baehrens; *hoc ipsum* is retained by W. A. Baehrens, who in *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 406 also adduces Sidon. *Apollin. ep.* 6, 8, 1 = 133, 22 Mohr). From Tert.'s writings he quotes *apol.* 15, 3: *ipsum quod imago dei vestri ignominiosum caput et famosum vestit . . . nonne violatur maiestas . . . ?*; *adv. Prax.* 9 (240, 10); *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (324, 7); 5, 3 (578, 19); 5, 4 (582, 2); 5, 16 (630, 23). To these he adds two different passages, viz. *adv. Herm.* 28 (156, 5/6): *etiam homini tenebrae visibiles sunt* (*hoc enim ipsum, quod sunt tenebrae, videtur*) and *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (459, 5). We may add *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (347, 8/10): *ipsum quod anima vocitatus est flatu, vide, ne etiam de adflatu condicione transierit in aliquam diminutiorum qualitatem*. W. A. Baehrens (*Beitr.*, 370/2) from an earlier period adduces Sen. *controv.* 1, 2, 2: *age, si quis hoc ipsum concupit, quod virgo eras?* (*ob hoc ipsum* Müller; here, however, as he remarks himself, *hoc ipsum* may also be regarded as the object of *concupit*; the other instances quoted by him are for the greater part of little value, as either the reading is uncertain or the case different). A few passages are added by Löfstedt, *Synt.*, 1, 206/7 who, like Baehrens, refers to the similar use of αὐτὸ τοῦτο = αὐτῷ τοῦτο in Greek (which may have furthered this use of *ipsum quod*, but did certainly not give rise to it). In the later period of the Latin language (*hoc, id*) *ipsum quod* very often occurs as a nom. or accus. (particularly in the works of Mar. Victorin., Hier., and Aug.), but rarely as equivalent to *ipso quod*; apart from the passages quoted by Harleman, 23/4, I can only adduce Coripp. *Justin.* 4, 319: *plus exaltatus, plus iustifi-*

catus id ipsum (rightly interpreted by Petschenig in the glossary added to his edition; in *ipso* Partsch), *quod se humilem . . . fatetur* and Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Genes.* 3, 2 and 7, 2. — *eandem . . . ipsam*: as to this differentiation, cf. the note on 10, 9. We may compare the discussion of this same subject by Mar. Victorin. *adv. Arium* 1, 23 (P. L. 8, 1056 D): *substantia enim secundum quod substantia est, non est alia, ut sit similis ad aliam; eadem enim est in duobus, et non est similis, sed ipsa. Sed alia cum sit, non quo substantia est similis dicitur, sed secundum quandam qualitatem.*

10. *divina pronuntiatio*: cf. 35, 5 n. — *et ip<se>, si*: a splendid conjecture by Thörnell, who gives the following interpretation (Eran. 7 (1907), 96): “sc. ut adversarii mei credunt. hi enim videlicet sententiam suam inde firmari contendebant, quod non modo homines sed deus et ipse tibi assentiretur”. — *de substantia*: for the use of *de* before an *ablat. limitationis*, cf. the comm. on 19, 5.

33. *Confutation of the theory that metempsychosis is necessary as a retribution for one's earthly life.*

“Similarly, when it is said that human souls, in return for their behaviour on earth, must enter the bodies of special kinds of animals, we may reply: if during their stay in such bodies the souls change, the retribution, which needs must correspond to their former existence, has become impossible (§ 1); if, on the other hand, the souls retain their identity for the purpose of being able to receive the reward handed out to them after death, as was assumed by the Mercury of the Egyptians as well, the value of such a reward may be regarded as highly questionable (§ 2). If, for instance, we suppose that the soul of a murderer enters the body of a butcher's beast to be slaughtered in its turn (§ 3), this punishment is really quite mild (§ 4), so that we would be obliged to admit that human justice is far severer than divine justice (§ 5). The same may be said with regard to all other penalties (§§ 6/7a). — If, on the other hand, we look for rewards given to virtuous souls, we cannot discover much that is desirable (§ 7b), vide the transformation of Homer into a peacock (§ 8). What animals could be noble enough to receive the souls of Aeacus and Dido? (§ 9). — It would be extremely surprising, if after death punishments were milder and rewards slighter (§ 10). Therefore we Christians believe in a different judgment after death, i. e. the Last Judgment, which will take place once only, when the souls will not enter animals, but their own bodies (§ 11)”.

The beginning of this chapter is to be regarded as the immediate continuation of the preceding one, as is shown by *Etiam*: “if the soul is changed in an animal body (32, 7/8), an eventual retribution after death becomes absurd too”. The subsequent paragraphs are no more than an ingenious elaboration of one single idea: “if the judgment after death requires the transmigration of souls for carrying out its verdicts, this judgment is as unworthy as it is inept”. This

elaboration may be supposed to be Tert.'s own work (whereas of course his knowledge of the view he refutes derives from an authority, possibly Albinus; cf. the Introduction, p. 42*); for instance, the description of the fate of the slaughtered cattle contains details which are also found in *de pallio* and were borrowed from Pliny. The digression on executions in § 5 and the abundant use made of terms from criminal law bespeaks the former lawyer; the discussion of the rewards given to the virtuous is based on the famous dream of Ennius, an author who was probably still read by Tert. (see comm. on 18, 1). For the mention of *Mercurius Aegyptius*, see the Introduction, p. 47*.

1. **Etiam**: see the preface to this chapter. — **iudicii**: this word seems to be chosen in the first place to form an antithesis with the end of the chapter, in which the Last Judgment is described (§ 10: *cum, si quod iudicium animas manet*, etc.; cf. also *apol.* 48, 4). The judgment meant here is, of course, of a different nature, as it is individual; hence such a word as *examen* (used in this context by [Apul.] *Asclep.* 28, see the note on *Mercurius Aegyptius* in § 2) might have expressed the underlying conception more accurately, but it stands to reason that Tert. passes over the difference. It is, however, also possible that the choice of the word is due to the Greek text used here by Tert., as in Greek κρίσις is put in both cases (e. g. *Corp. Herm., libell.* 10, 16 (198, 8/9 Scott): καταλιπὼν τὴν ψυχὴν κρίσει καὶ τῇ κατ' ἀξίαν δίκῃ ~ Tatian. *orat.* 6: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σωμάτων ἀνάστασιν ἔσσεσθαι . . . χάριν κρίσεως). As to the view combated here, cf. e. g. Plato *Leg.* 9, 870 D/E: καὶ πάλιν ἀφικόμενοις δεῦρο ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὴν κατὰ φύσιν δίκην ἐκτίσαι, τὴν τοῦ παθόντος, ἅπερ αὐτὸς ἔδρασεν and 10, 904 E (*Resp.* 10, 614 B *seqq.* and the *Phaedo* do not furnish exact parallels); Plotin. 8, 4, 1; for the *Pistis Sophia*, cf. Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 274. — **dogma**: for this word, cf. Thes. I. L. V, 1: 1813, 1/1817, 50; Dibelius' note on Coloss. 2, 14 (*Hdb. N. T.* 12, p. 24); A. Deneffe, *Dogma, Wort und Begriff* (Scholastik 6 (1931), 381/400 and 505/38; p. 513 he wrongly remarks that Tert. and Cypr. do not seem to know the word); Kl. Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius von Jerusalem I* (Münster i. W. 1931), 59 *seq.* This seems to be the first instance of this word in Christian Latin. In the sense of 'philosophic tenet' it occurs in Latin from Cic. downwards (who *Acad.* 2, 27 adds an explanation, which he omits *ib.* 2, 106. 133); referring to metempsychosis it is found in Laber. *mim.* 18 (a passage known to Tert., as is shown by *apol.* 48); Porphyry. *ad Hor. ep.* 2, 1, 51; Aug. *de civ. dei.* 10, 30 *tit.*, etc. Not before the fourth century do we find it used to denote the tenets of the Church. — **occisoriis: ἀ. λ., famulatoriis** (also *ad nat.* 2, 14, 4): **Τρ. dispungentur**: this verb, which occurs from Velleius downwards, and in general is rarely found, is used 23 times by Tert. (Thes. I. L. V, 1: 1437, 10 *seqq.*; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 130; Blokhuis, 139). Three different significations are found in his works: a) *absolvere, complere* (15 instances); b) *examinare* (*apol.* 45, 7; *ad nat.* 1, 2, 5); c) *repensare* (*c. Chr.* 5, 47; *exh. cast.* 2, 19; *adv. Marc.* 2, 23 (367, 1); *mon.* 8; *res.* 56 (115, 17); *apol.* 37, 3).

2. **Evacuabitur** (from Plin. *n. h.* and Colum. downwards) is rarely used by pagan authors; in Tert.'s works it either means 'to free' (e. g. Rom. 7, 2 in *mon.* 13) or (mostly) 'to abolish', 'to destroy', e. g. *pat.* 12 (19, 23/4): *nam cetera evacuabuntur consummabuntur exhaurentur*. — **Acque si** also occurs in *adv. Prax.* 10 (241, 11) and 15 (254, 2); cf. 16, 2. — **Mercurius Aegyptius**: for Tertullian's knowledge of Hermetic literature, see the Introduction, p. 47*. According to W. Kroll, R. E. VIII, 821, this passage "does not refer to any of the extant treatises". This remark is hardly right, as various parallels may be adduced. As to the *iudicium*, cf. the passage quoted in § 1 and [Apul.] *Asclep.* 28 (66, 7 *seqq.* Thomas): *cum fuerit animae e corpore facta discessio, tunc arbitrium examenque meriti eius transiet in summi daemonis potestatem* (*ib.* 66, 23 *seqq.* the author contends that the punishment after death is severer than the penalties in this life, which is exactly the view combated by Tert. as far as metempsychosis is concerned). With the words *manere determinatam* we may compare *Poimandres* 1, 26: "after death man remains τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν ἔχων"; *Exc.* XXV, 4 (508, 22 Scott): ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ πρᾶγμα ἰδιοφυές; especially *lib.* 10, 19a (200, 12/4 *ib.*): ἡ δὲ ἀσεβῆς ψυχὴ μένει ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίᾳς, ὅφ' ἐαυτῆς κολαζομένη, καὶ γήινον σῶμα ζητοῦσα εἰς ὃ εἰσέλθῃ; *Exc.* XXV, 3 (508, 5 *seqq.*): οὐ γάρ, ὦ θαυμαστὲ καὶ μεγάλου πατρὸς Ὁσίρεως μέγα τέκνον, ἀκρίτως καὶ ὀρμηδὸν τῶν σωμάτων προελθοῦσαι εἰς ἀέρα ἀναχύνονται ἀκρίτως καὶ διασκεδάννυνται μετὰ τοῦ ἄλλου ἀπείρου πνεύματος· εἰτα οὐκέτι δύνασθαι πάλιν τὰς αὐτὰς... εἰς ἄλλα σώματα παλινδρομῆσαι. For passages referring to metempsychosis, see W. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, and Jos. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Herm. Trismeg.*, 269. As the chronology of the treatises belonging to the *Corpus Hermeticum* remains highly uncertain, we may be justified in contending that Tert. must have known at least one of the passages just quoted. — **refundi**: for the use of this term, cf. Hilar. *de trin.* 8, 5: *quia homines in deum refundi non possunt*; Rufin.-Gregor. Nazianz. *orat.* 1, 38, 1: *vel commisceri ac refundi (filium) in patrem*. — **utique divini** may contain a reminiscence of 28, 1: *divinum (veterem sermonem) Albinus existimat, Mercurii forsitan Aegyptii*. — **praesidet 'thrones'**, cf. *res.* 16 (45, 26/7): *itaque animae solius iudicium praesidere*; *ib.* 14 (43, 19/20). — **humana censura**: as opposed to the *censura divina* (58, 6; *apol.* 39, 3; *res.* 17 = 48, 26; cf. Beck, 170₂).

3. **decorietur** (from Apic. 8, 370 downwards) is a very rare word. — **perinde . . . quia** is a contamination of *perinde . . . ut* and *ideo . . . quia*; similarly, *spect.* 12 (14, 23/4): *proinde . . . quoniam*; cf. Thörnell, *Éran.* 16 (1916), 123. — **despoliaverit** = *cute spoliaverit*, as in Apul. *met.* 4, 21 (90, 24 H.). — **in pabulum proponatur** "may be dished up as food"; cf. the note on 19, 6: *anima . . . in propaginem* (= sicut propago) *deducta*. — **fecerit**, sc. (*in*) *pabulum* (already rightly interpreted by Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 72).

4. **solacii**: cf. 7, 1 n. — **Apicianis**, etc.: a similar enumeration occurs in *de pall.* 5; it derives from Plin. *n. h.* (cf. Geffcken,

Kyn., 128/9). Apicius only is not mentioned there (however, the name is found in § 7: *taceo Neronis et Apicios, Rufos*; also in *iei.* 12 (291, 12) and *apol.* 3, 6); cf. *Plin. n. h.* 10, 133: *Apicius . . . nepotum omnium altissimus gurgis*; Otto, *Sprichw.*, 29; Gerlo, 2, 199/200. — *Lurconianis*: *pall.* 5, 6: *praecidam gulam, qua Hortensius orator primus pavum cibi causa potuit occidere, qua Aufidius Lurco primus sagina corpora vitavit et coactis alimentis in adulterinum provexit saporem*; *Plin. n. h.* 10, 45; for more details, see Gerlo, 2, 195. — *mensis Ciceronianis*: *pall.* 5, 5: *adigo cauterem ambitioni, qua M. Tullius quingentis milibus nummum orbem citri emit*; *Plin.* 13, 92; Gerlo, 2, 188. — *lancibus . . . Sullanis*: *pall.* 5, 5: (ambitionem) *qua lances centenarii ponderis Sulla molitur*.

5. *exquisitis*: this adj. is often used in connection with torments, e. g. *apol.* 50, 13: *exquisitior quaeque crudelitas vestra* (Tac. *ann.* 15, 44: *quaesitissimis poenis*); Suet. *Tib.* 62; Amm. Marc. 26, 6, 7; Lucifer Calaurit. *mor. esse pro fil. dei* 3 (290, 11/2 Hartel); Heges. 5, 53, 1; Pass. *Macchab.* 5, 33. — *praeter naturam eruditis*: cf. Suet. *Calig.* 27: *ferarum muneri praeparatarum*; [Cypr.] *de spect.* 5 (7, 17/9 H.): *erudit artifex belluam, quae clementior fortasse fuisset, si non illam magister crudelior saevire docuisset*; Pass. *Perpet.* 20, 1: *Vaccam . . . praeter consuetudinem comparatam*; Amm. Marc. 29, 1, 27: *iamque eruditior ad laedendum in modum harenariae ferae*; Acta *Perpet.* B 9, 3: *leones . . . humana industria praeparati*; Acta *Pauli et Theclae* 33 (Act. apost. apocr. I: 259, 5/6): λέων δεδιδασμέυος ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους. With *praeter naturam* we may compare Tert.'s words about Vedius Pollio (*pall.* 5, 6): *de piscibus* (sc. muraenis) *placuit feras cogere*. — *dissipant* = *dilaniant*, cf. Waltz., *comm.*, 238; Löfstedt, *Apol.*, 44 and *Krit. Apol.*, 74. — *facile nec* (A) has been interpreted in the right way by Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 72/3: "Tert. will sagen, der Verbrecher werde lebendig den wilden Tieren vorgeworfen, ja, es komme leicht oder häufig vor, dass man ihn nicht sterben lasse". — *mora finis* may be a reminiscence from *apol.* 39, 2, where these words occur in a totally different context. — *praefugerit* is ἀ. λ.; *ultimo gladio* is, of course, a dative. Cf. *apol.* 21, 19: *nam spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit, praevento carnificis officio* (≈ Ioh. 19, 30; similarly, [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 14 and Vict. Petav., *comm. in Apoc.* 5, 2, *recens. Hier.*). — *iugulo utroque confossis*: it seems possible to retain this reading of A. Cf. *Apul. met.* 1, 13 (12, 12/4 Helm): *et capite Socratis in alterum dimoto latus per iugulum sinistrum capulo tenuis gladium totum ei demergit*; hence a transfixion of both *iugula* is possible as well. For Rigaltius' conjecture *uteroque* (*uterus* = *venter*, cf. Rönsch, *Sem.*, 1, 75; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 73), which, as regards palaeography, is far more probable than *ventroque*, the reading proposed by Latinus, no references can be adduced; the same is to be said of his second conjecture, *viroque* = *genitalibus* (for this sense of *vir*, cf. Kroll's note on Catull. 63, 6; Hagendahl, *La prose métrique d'Arnobé*, 149/50; Lucan. 10, 134: (iuventus) *exsecta virum*; Tert. *pall.* 4, 2 with Gerlo's note, 2, 110). A parallel is furnished by Spart. *Hadr.* 26, 3 (a similar context): *iugulum et costam fregit* (Tert.: *i u g u l o u t r o q u e c o n f o s s i s c o s t i s q u e t r a n s f i x i s*). Though it is

not altogether out of the question that we should follow Ursinus in writing *confosso* (the ending *-is* may be due to the influence of the next words *costisque transfixis*), the plural *confossis* may be explained as an instance of the *constructio ad sententiam*. In a principal sentence the plural occurs already in Plaut. *Men.* 785: *neuter ad me iretis* (also cf. Iul. Valer. 1, 14: *quid . . . uterque commeruimus?*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 635); closer parallels are furnished by Sil. Ital. 12, 480/1: *iam consul uterque praecipites aderant*, Apul. *met.* 1, 21 and 11, 29, and the passages adduced by W. A. Baehrens, *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 421/2 and Chruzander, 93. As is shown by *nihilominus*, the meaning of the passage is that the finishing stroke (*ultimus gladius*), which had been intended for the living victim, was also dealt to his dead body; hence we may compare such a passage as *Pass. Perpet.* 21, 9, where the giving of the finishing stroke is described: *Perpetua autem, ut aliquid doloris gustaret, inter ossa* (περὶ τὰ ὀστέα; some manuscripts have *inter costas*) *compuncta exululavit, et errantem dexteram tirunculi gladiatoris ipsa in iugulum suum transtulit*. Cf. also Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 163 (629 B): *namque cessante gladio carnifex improbissimus exanime grassatur in corpus, laniat, dissipat, spargit, ne quid funeris inventum quieti misericors sepultura commendet*. — **proprii** is rather surprising (*propria* v. d. Vliet), but may perhaps be retained, if we regard *facinoris* as a *genit. explicativus*: “a retribution consisting in a crime (i. e. the cruel execution) appropriate <to the crime committed by the murderer, i. e. being an appropriate punishment for it>”. — **in ignem . . . puniatur**: for the refusal of interment to executed people, especially those guilty of high-treason, see Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 217; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 87; Mommsen, *Röm. Strafrecht*, 987/9; cf. also Achelis, 2, 442 (*Exk.* 95: interdiction of interment of Christian martyrs for the purpose of exterminating the cult of relics). Concerning Tert.’s aversion from cremation, see the note on 51, 4: *poenali exitu*. — **Nec . . . tanta**: ‘not particularly great’; see Rothstein’s note on Prop. 2, 7, 17; Svénn., *Pallad.*, 403 and 645. Cf. also Curt. 10, 5, 8 and *C. E. L.* 1604 (the instances quoted from Vellei. and inscriptions by B. Kübler, *A. L. L.* 8, 187, are highly questionable); from Tert. cf. perhaps *apol.* 17, 2: *ideo verus et tantus* (sc. *deus est*). For *non tam* = *non magnopere, non vehementer*, see Löfstedt, *Glotta* 3 (1912), 25/6 and *Per.*, 332/3, Hofm., *Synt.*, 730, for the connection of *tam* with an adj. for the purpose of denoting a particularly high degree, Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbar.* 2, 640; cf. also the use of *totiens* in Tac. *ann.* 4, 9, 1. — **aliae bestiae**: this either refers to the animals the criminal had been thrown to or to the executioners (in this case we may assume perhaps some influence of 32, 9: *si saeva bestia . . . vocetur homo*). — **nec ossibus parcitur**: see Mommsen, *loc. cit.* Many parallels may be adduced from the *Acta martyrum*, e. g. Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 5, 1, 61 (the martyrs of Lyons), *mart. Polycarpi ex.*, *mart. Sabae* 8, 1, *mart. Fructuosi* 6, 1. *nuditas*: Tp.

6. **Quis . . . iustitiam**: a similar argument occurs in *ad uxor.* 2, 8: *severiores habebuntur terrenae disciplinae caelestibus praeceptis? ut*

gentiles quidem extraneis iunctae libertatem suam amittant, nostrae vero diaboli servos sibi coniungant et in statu suo perseverent?; *res.* 15 (45, 9/15); *apol.* 28,2 (the *maiestas* of the emperors more august than the majesty of the gods; cf. Heinze, *Apol.*, 334); for more details, see Beck, 61. Such discussions as the one found here clearly show how strongly Tert. always admired Roman legislation, and they, more than his numerous 'juridical' formulations, are able to dissipate any doubt about his earlier profession of lawyer. The next words *quam et apostolus*, etc., also demonstrate that Tert.'s admiration for the *iustitia saeculi* is not exclusively due to the testimony of St. Paul. — *vivicomburia*: Mommsen, *op. cit.*, 923. — *culleos*: the well-known punishment of parricides (*dig.* 48, 9, 9), also mentioned *ad nat.* 2, 13, 16; cf. Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, and Hitzig, R. E. IV, 1747 *seq.* — *uneos*: which were used to drag the dead bodies of criminals along the *Scalae Gemoniae* into the Tiber: Cic. *pro Rab.* 5, 16 and *Phil.* 1, 2, 5; Prop. 4, 1, 141, etc.; cf. Mommsen, *loc. cit.* — *scopulos*: Mommsen, 931/4.

7. *reecorporabuntur*: Tp. — *aquilegis*: Tp; only here the word is used as an adjunct. (in later times it means 'sorcerer': C. I. L. II, 5726; Cassiodor. *Var.* 3, 53, 1). The subst. *aquilex* occurs *adv. Marc.* 3, 5 (382, 19). — *metallorum*: Mommsen, *op. cit.*, 949/51, *ergastulorum*, *ib.*, 962/3, *operum publicorum*, *ib.*, 952. *carcerum* . . . *otiosorum*: cf. e. g. *adv. Prax.* 1 (228, 2/3): *ob solum et simplex et breve carceris taedium*; Valerian. *homil.* 16: *tenebrosis sedibus otiosa supplicia*. Similar enumerations occur very often, e. g. *apol.* 27, 7: *ergastulorum sive carcerum vel metallorum*; Liv. 7, 4, 4; Iuven. 14, 24; Vincent. Lerin. 4, 6. The mention of the mules may be a reminiscence of *apol.* 48, 1 (cf. also *ad nat.* 1, 19, 4) (Laberius): *hominem fieri ex mulo*. — *qui* instead of *si qui* (see the note on 9, 1), here due to parallelism (*Nam et qui . . . Perinde qui*). — *quaecumque*: cf. 37, 1.

8. *Pavum*: the usual form in Tert. (in *de anima* three more times; moreover, *pall.* 3, 1; 5, 6; *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (308, 4); *res.* 1 (26, 1); *ad nat.* 1, 19, 4 according to the reading by Borleffs), probably borrowed from Ennius (*Ann.* 15 Vahlen). — *Pavum* . . . *somniante*: Enn., *loc. cit.*: *memini me fieri pavum*. Cf. the note on 31, 6: *cur neminem se retro meminit Epicurus?* The transformation into a peacock (cf. *ad nat.* 1, 19, 4) had been dated between the death of Homer and the birth of Ennius, as is shown by *res.* 1 (25, 18/26, 1; this passage, which, besides Pers. 6, 10 (and the scholion), is the only one where this is clearly expressed, ought to have been quoted in full by Vahlen in his note on *Ann.* 15): *etsi non in eadem, etsi non in humana tantummodo, ut Euphorbus in Pythagoram, Homerus in pavum recenseantur* (sc. *animae*); schol. ad Pers. 6, 10: *sic Ennius ait in annalium suorum principio, ubi dicit se vidisse in somnis Homerum dicentem fuisse quondam pavonem et ex eo translatam in se* (sc. Ennium) *animam esse secundum Pythagorae philosophi definitionem* (that the second *se* refers to Ennius is proved by the scholion on Pers. prol. 2: *tangit Ennium qui dixit se vidisse per somnium in Parnaso Homerum sibi*

dicentem quod eius anima in suo esset corpore). With regard to the erroneous descriptions given by Lactant. Placid. in *Stat. Theb.* 3, 483 and Acro in *Hor. carm.* 1, 28, 10, see my discussion of Pers. 6, 9/11 in *Mnemos.* III ser., 11 (1942), 68/71. — *sed . . . credam*: cf. 57, 12 and 34, 5: *inter poetas et haereticos*. — *sed . . . sed*: an anaphora found very often in Tert.'s writings; cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 73; Thörn., *Eran.* 16 (1916), 127/8. — *Damnatus . . . honoratus*: to my knowledge, this antithesis occurs nowhere else; we may compare the very common contrast *ornare-onerare* (Otto, *Sprichw.*, 167; Weyman, *A. L. L.* 8, 30; Blümlein, *ib.* 8, 586; Sonny, *ib.* 9, 64; Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 56 (1927), 235). For Tert.'s estimation of Homer, cf. especially *ad nat.* 1, 10, 38/9. — *caudae*: a minute description of the peacock's tail occurs in *pall.* 3, 1 (in part borrowed from Plin. *n. h.* 10, 43); cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (308, 4).

9. *Age nunc* occurs very often in Tert. (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 86/7). — *poetae . . . in cyenos transeant*: Plato *Resp.* 10, 620 A; *Hor. carm.* 2, 20; perhaps Aristoph. *Aves* 1373; cf. Kroll, *Stud. z. röm. Lit.*, 288. — *si . . . vox est*: cf. e. g. Aesch. *Agam.* 1444/7; Eur. *Herc. fur.* 692; Arist. *hist. anim.* 615b 2/5; Thes. I. L. IV: 1585, 16/41; F. Sassen, *Κύκνος μελωδός* (Neophilol. 28 (1943), 152/3). — *indues*: similarly, Apul. *met.* 2, 22 (43, 17/8 H.): *nam et aves et rursum canes et mures, immo vero etiam muscas induunt* (sc. versipelles); the expression may partly be due to the very common formula *Christus hominem induit* (e. g. Pelag. in *Rom.* 1, 16; cf. also *res.* 62 = 123, 18). — *Aeaco* (Ursinus) is the most plausible correction of *deloco* (*de loco*), the reading of A B; at all events, it is to be preferred to the conjectures by Latinus (*Deioci*) and Leopardus (*Deiocae*), as the first king of the Medians (Hdt. 1, 96) was neither particularly famous on account of his justice nor sufficiently known to be mentioned besides Dido. On the other hand, Aeacus was generally regarded as a pattern of righteousness (from Isocrates 9, 14, 15 downwards); his popularity is also shown by the fact that, besides Amphiaraus, he is the only mythical hero mentioned in the magical papyri (Hopfner, *Gr.-äq. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 58/9). — *Dido* is often mentioned by Christian apologists as a paragon of chastity and courage: *ad mart.* 4; *ad nat.* 1, 18, 3; *apol.* 50, 5; *exh. cast.* 13, 26; *mon.* 17; Min. Fel. 20, 6; Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 43 (for this passage, see Bickel, *Diatribae in Sen. fragm.*, 1, 239 and 244/5). — *famula . . . hominis*: as an adj. *famulus* is very rarely connected with a genit.; another instance occurs *res.* 47 (96, 11/4; = *Rom.* 6, 19): *sicut exhibuistis membra vestra famula inmunditiae et iniquitatis ad iniquitatem, ita et nunc exhibete membra vestra famula iustitiae in sanctificium* (the original text has the dative: *δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ*; the quotation found in *pud.* 17 (257, 8/10) is partly identical). For the conception, cf. 22, 2: (animam) *dominatricem* with the note, and *pat.* 4 (5, 18/9): (bestias) *usibus nostris . . . a domino provisae traditaeque*. — *mancipata*: for this law term, see Beck, 104 and 166; cf. *spect.* 2 (2, 24/5): *universitatem . . . homini mancipatam*. — *diminoratur*: Τρ. — *imagines . . . privilegia*: two ἀσύνδετα (for the com-

bination *imagines, statuæ*, cf. e. g. *apol.* 12, 7; 29, 2; *scorp.* 6 (156, 24); Plin. *paneg.* 55, 10; Apul. *met.* 2, 1; Min. Fel. 20, 5; 27, 1; Marcian. *dig.* 7, 1, 41 *pr.*). For similar instances, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 32/3; cf. also S H A *Maxim.* 15, 4: *amici et administratores et duces, tribuni et milites*. — *suffragiis immolat*: the earliest instances of a metaphorical use of *immolare* are found in Tert.'s works (Thes. I. L. VII, 1: 489, 77 *seqq.*), in which they are particularly numerous. We must start from passages in which prayers, hymns, contrition, etc. are represented as sacrifices offered up to God, e. g. *paen.* 12, 7: *paenitentiam domino immolat*; *pud.* 10 (239, 10/1); *iei.* 10 (288, 7/8): *haec erit statio sera quæ ad vesperam ieiunans pinguorem orationem deo immolat*; *pat.* 10 (15, 24); *cult. fem.* 2, 9, 7. For the similar use of *mactare, obicere, libare*, and *litare*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 188; cf. also *res.* 8 (37, 8/10): *virginitas quoque et viduitas . . . de bonis carnis deo adolentur*. The conception of prayer as a sacrifice, which occurs already in the Old Test. and the *Corpus Hermeticum* (λογική θυσία; cf. Kroll, R. E. VIII, 815; Reitzenstein, *Myster.*, 38 and 180 *seqq.*) is very common in early Christianity; cf. Thes. I. L., *loc. cit.*; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 186; Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 80/1; Achelis, 1, 167 and 291; Adam, *Kirch. Tert.*, 99, and 102/3; Lietzmann's note on Rom. 12, 1 (*Hdb. N. T.* 8, p. 108); Windisch's note on 1 Petr. 2, 5 (*ib.* 15, p. 60); Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 328/9. A freer use of *immolare* is found in *pat.* 13 (20, 17): *immolata patientia corporis sui*; *apol.* 6, 10; *spect.* 10 (12, 26/7); *idol.* 6 (36, 5/6). It stands to reason that in this passage the *ablat. suffragiis* contains the object of *immolat* (cf. *tauro litare*, etc.); Hoppe, *loc. cit.*, is certainly wrong in presuming that this verb has no object here.

10. *contemptibilia*: a 'Christianism', found for the first time in the *Itala*; *fastidibilis* is ἀ. λ. — Instead of *eam* Kroymann proposes to read *ea*, as the pronoun must refer to the *iudicia divina*; however, it seems possible to supply *iustitiam divinam* (cf. the immediately preceding words *iustitiam sæculi*). — *debet*: there is no necessity to read *debeat* (B Gel), for *cum*, if it is an adversative conjunction, is sometimes followed by an indic.: *ad ux.* 2, 3; *cult. fem.* 2, 8, 1; *fuga* 2, 5. (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 80; *adv. Herm.* 1 should not be adduced in this context, cf. Kok, 173); for *apol.* 2, 1 (F), see Löfst., *Apol.*, 16/7. — *dispunetione* in Tert.'s works either means 'examination' (e. g. *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (617, 7); *apol.* 18, 3) or 'completion' (e. g. *test. anim.* 4 (138, 12): *post vitæ-nem*); the first meaning occurs frequently in the works of lawyers, e. g. Ulp. *dig.* 42, 5, 15, 1. — *administratione*: similarly, *res.* 15 (44, 8/9); *in vitæ administratione . . . i. v. remuneratione*. — *extremus*: this comparative occurs for the first time in the *metam.* of Apuleius, who, just like Tert., does not yet regard it as completely equivalent to *posterius* (which is the usual sense in the last period of the Latin language), but only uses it for a special reason: 1, 8 (8, 1 H.) *si quid est tamen novissimo extremus* (a parallel is furnished by Goethe, *Marienbader Elegie*: „Selbst nach dem letzten Kuss mich noch ereilte, Den letzten mir auf die Lippen drückte"); 7, 2 (155, 25): *quod . . . cunctis est extremus*. Here the meaning is: 'nearer to

the <extreme> end of the world'. A striking parallel is furnished by the preface to the *Passio Perpetuae* (1, 3), which perhaps had Tert. for its author: *cum maiora reputanda sunt novitiora quaeque, ut novissimiora* (similarly = 'nearer to the end of the world'). For *plenius* we may compare *res.* 14 (43, 22): *plenum . . . perfectumque . . . iudicium dei* and *Min. Fel.* 34, 12.

11. *tam . . . refrigerii*: similarly, *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 19 *seq.*) and *res.* 17 (47, 21). For *refrigerium*, see P. Paolucci, *R.* (Camarina 1923); F. Grossi-Gondi, *Röm. Quartalschrift* 29 (1915), 221/49 and *Dissert. della Pontif. Accad. di archeol.* II, 14 (Rome 1920); G. van der Leeuw, *Mnemos.* III ser., 3 (1935/6), 125/48; Parrot, *Rev. hist. relig.* 115 (1937), 53/89. — The form *animabus* (also 54, 2 and *res.* 17 = 48, 28) is frequently used by Christian authors, cf. *Thes.* I. L. II: 70, 8 *seqq.*; Neue-Wagener, I³, 45; Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wortformen*, 48; Rönsch, *It.*², 265. — *semel*: 'once for all', cf. Oehler's note on *fuga* 2. — *quem . . . novit*: that the uncertainty about the time of the resurrection is beneficial to mankind, is also pointed out by Hippol., *comm. in Daniel* 4, 16, Hieron. *tract. in evang. Marc.* (Anecd. Mareds. III 2, p. 366), and the author of a sermon on the Ascension (Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigte*, p. 189). — *pendula*: cf. *Hor. ep.* 1, 18, 110: *spe pendulus*. With this passage we may compare Hilar. *de trin.* 9, 67: *ut pendulae exspectationis incerto mens sollicita, festinans et adventus diem semper exspectans, semper exspectando speraret*; cf. also *apol.* 49, 2. — The transmigration of souls and the resurrection are also contrasted with each other by Basilus (cf. Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 43₂) and Gregor. Nyss. (P. G. 46, 108 C); cf. also *ad nat.* 1, 19, 4 and Ambros. *de excess. frat. Satyri* 2, 65: *illud mirum, quod cum resurrectionem non credant, tamen ne genus pereat hominum, clementi quadam benignitate prospiciunt; et ideo transire ac demigrare in corpora dicunt animas, ne mundus intereat. Sed quid sit difficilior, ipsi asserant, transire animas an redire, sua repetere, an nova quaerere*. On the other hand, Celsus contended (*Orig. c. Cels.* 7, 32) that the Christians had hit upon the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh τῆς μετενσωματώσεως παραχούσαντες (see Labriolle, *Réaction pai.*, 118). — *timens . . . sperat*: cf. the similar description of the influence of persecutions on faith in the contemporary treatise *de fuga* (1, 6); see also Brandt, 137.

34—35. Heretics adhering to the doctrine of metempsychosis.

a) 34. *Simon Magus*.

"Though hitherto no heretic has appeared who asserted that a human soul may enter the body of an animal, I have also discussed this form of metempsychosis or metensomatosis for the purpose of attacking from this side as well the other (i. e. the 'Pythagorean') form of this doctrine, by which some heretics were influenced (§ 1). First I shall discuss Simon of Samaria. This heretic, who with his money had been damned to perdition by St. Peter, used this same

money to rescue a woman, Helen of Tyrus, from a brothel (§ 2); next he pretended to be the supreme Father and Helen to be 'his first conception', which had induced him to create the angels and archangels. 'But Helen', so he continues, 'fled from the Father, descended to lower spheres, and there created angels who did not know the Father and who detained her in captivity, lest, if she should depart from them, they should be regarded as creatures of another Being. After this she was abandoned to every imaginable ignominy; for instance she obtained a human shape (§ 3), continually entered new bodies, for some time was the famous Helen of Troy, and finally fell to the state of a prostitute. Thereupon the Father descended in his own person to release her; as he wanted to outwit the angels, he passed himself off as the Son in Iudaea, in Samaria as the Father' (§ 4). — We may say that Helen of Troy was released more gallantly by Menelaus! (§ 5)".

As for the sources of the life and system of Simon Magus, which need not concern us here, see A. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*², 163/86; H. Waitz in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopädie*³, 18, 351/2 and ZNTW 5 (1904), 121/43; E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme*², 216/26; H. Lietzmann, R. E. II, 3: 180/4; R. A. Lipsius, *Quellen der röm. Petrusage* (Kiel 1872), 88 *seqq.*; Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, 190/2. Here we must only examine the authority used by Tert.

As is generally known, the description given by Irenaeus (1, 16, 1/2 Harvey) is very similar to the contents of the chapter under discussion; nevertheless, Hilgenfeld supposes that Tert. must have used other sources as well, as some details of his account do not correspond with Irenaeus' text. Hence he thinks that Tert. also consulted the Σύνταγμα by Justin (both works are mentioned in *adv. Val.* 5 (182, 11/3): *ut Justinus, philosophus et martyr, . . . ut Irenaeus, omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator*), whereas Harnack (*Zur Quellenkritik der Gesch. des Gnosticismus* (Leipsic 1873), 71 *seqq.* and *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* 1874, 2: 143/226) even assumes that the Σύνταγμα was his only source. On the contrary, Lipsius (*Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergesch. neu untersucht* (Leipsic 1875), 64/83 and 179/90) contends that Tert.'s account contains nothing that is not found in Iren. as well (cf. 73/4; 82/3; 64/5 : „Hie und da finden sich Umstellungen und kleine Abweichungen, die jedoch ebensowenig wie die zuweilen ziemlich freie Reproduktion des vorgefundenen Ausdrucks auf Benutzung einer zweiten Quelle oder gar auf eine dem Irenäus und Tertullian gemeinsame Grundschrift schliessen lassen"). This view is shared by Lietzmann (*loc. cit.*, 180: "Iren. I 23 (= Tert. de anima 34)") and Roberts, *Theol. of Tert.*, 58.

According to Hilgenfeld (180/1), the account given by Tert. contains two important details not found in Iren., viz. the words *praevento patris proposito* in § 3 and *quibus fallendis* (Simon's desire to outwit the angels) in § 4. Moreover, he refers to the mention of the *Simoniani* in 57, 7 and *praescr.* 33, 32, and of the statue of Simon at Rome in *apol.* 13, 9.

As regards the last-named argument, Hilgenfeld has overlooked the fact that Irenaeus does mention this statue (1, 16, 1: *sub Claudio*

Caesare, a quo etiam statua honoratus esse dicitur propter magicam); the same is to be said of the *Simoniani* (*ib.* 1, 16, 3; see the note on 57, 7). As to the two remaining passages, we can only subscribe to Lipsius' view that their importance is not to be exaggerated: a close examination of the two accounts will bring to light many other additions by Tert., but they only contain ironical explanations of Irenaeus' text, which might easily be invented.

First of all, we shall quote the text of Tert.'s source, after which we shall point out the differences.

Irenaeus gives a more detailed account of the contents of Act. apost. 8 than Tert., who devotes only one sentence to this part of the story (*in actis apostolorum . . . artis suae viribus*; Tert. *conversus.... expugnacionem* ∞ Iren. *et cupidus intendit contendere adversus apostolos*; Tert. *fulsus . . . viribus* ∞ Iren. *et universam magicam adhuc amplius inscrutans*). The last but one sentence of Iren. § 1 is put by Tert. at the end of § 4, the last at the beginning of § 3 (Iren.: *Esse autem se sublimissimam virtutem, hoc est eum, qui sit super omnia Pater* ∞ Tert.: *et se quidem fingit summum patrem*). Reckoning from the second sentence of Iren. § 2, Tert. follows his source more closely, which therefore may be quoted in full: *Hic Helenam quandam, quam ipse a Tyro civitate Phoenices quaestuariam cum redemisset, secum circumducebat, dicens hanc esse primam mentis eius conceptionem, matrem omnium, per quam in initio mente concepit angelos facere et archangelos. Hanc enim Ennoiam exsipientem ex eo, cognoscentem quae vult pater eius, degredi ad inferiora, et generare angelos et potestates, a quibus et mundum hunc factum dixit. Posteaquam autem generavit eos, haec detenta est ab ipsis propter invidiam, quoniam nollent progenies alterius cuiusdem putari esse. Ipsum enim se in totum ignoratum ab ipsis: Ennoiam autem eius detentam ab iis, quae ab ea emissae essent potestates, et angeli; et omnem contumeliam ab iis passam, uti non recurreret sursum ad suum patrem, usque adeo ut et in corpore humano includeretur, et per saecula veluti de vase in vas transmigraret in altera muliebria corpora. Fuisse autem eam et in illa Helena, propter quam Troianum contractum est bellum;* (fragment of the original text, preserved by Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 16, 19) οὕτως γοῦν τὸν Στῆσίχορον διὰ τῶν ἐπῶν λοιδορήσαντα αὐτὴν, τὰς ὀφείας τυφλωθῆναι· αὐτὴς δὲ, μεταμεληθέντος αὐτοῦ καὶ γράψαντος τὰς παλινωδίας ἐν αἷς ὕμνησεν αὐτὴν, ἀναβλέψαι. Μετενσωματουμένην ex eo et semper contumeliam sustinentem, in novissimis etiam in fornice prostitisse: et hanc esse ovem perditam. Quapropter et ipsum venisse, uti eam assumeret primam et liberaret eam a vinculis, (Hippol.) οὕτως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις σωτηρίαν παρέσχε διὰ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιγνώσεως. Κακῶς γὰρ διοικούντων τῶν ἀγγέλων τὸν κόσμον, διὰ τὸ φιλαρχεῖν αὐτούς, εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐληλυθέναι αὐτὸν ἔφη μεταμορφούμενον καὶ ἑξομοιούμενον ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἑξουσίαις, καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, ὥς καὶ ἀνθρώπων φαίνεσθαι αὐτὸν μὴ ὄντα ἀνθρώπον, καὶ παθεῖν δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ δεδωκεῖν καὶ μὴ πεπονθότα. . . (§ 1) et docuit semetipsum esse qui inter Iudaeos quidem quasi Filius apparuerit, in Samaria autem quasi Pater descenderit, in reliquis vero gentibus quasi spiritus sanctus adven-taverit.

The following details in Tert.'s account do not correspond with Irenaeus' text:

§ 2. *quasi pro solacio ultionis*: an ironical parenthesis after *veritatis expugnationem*. — *eadem pecunia* is a repetition of the preceding words *cum pecunia sua*; Tert. has a special liking for this use of *idem*, cf. the comm. on § 2. — *dignam sibi mercedem pro spiritu sancto* (*viz. Helenam*): a joke typical of Tert. — § 3. *praevento patris proposito*: a conclusion drawn from the context; note the alliteration. — *depretiatam* (a verb frequently used by Tert.): this follows from *omni contumelia addictam*. — *velut vinculis carnis coercendam* contains an explanation of *humanae . . . formae succidisse*. — § 4. *Priamo*: Iren. has *propter quam Troianum contractum est bellum*; Tert. mentions the name to get an antithesis *Priamus . . . Stesichorus*. — *Helenam viliozem*: an ironical remark of the same kind as *depretiatam* in § 3. — *pater summus*, *Simon scilicet*: Iren. *ipsum*. An anticlimax: *pater summus . . . Simon*. — *revecta . . . feminibus*: a very obscene remark (see the comm.). — *quasi per vindictam liberandorum ex illis angelicis potestatibus*: the 'juridical' formulation clearly shows to whom this remark should be referred. On account of all these details we are justified in also regarding the words *quibus fallendis* as an addition by Tert.

According to Hilgenfeld (176), Irenaeus has changed the order of the original account by mentioning Simon's appearance in Judaea and Samaria immediately after the quotation from the Acts of the Apostles, whereas Tert. and Hippolyt. (*refut.* 1, 6, 19) have preserved the sequence of the story as given in the Σύνταγμα by Justin. Against this Lipsius (l. c. 78) rightly observes: "Wahrscheinlich hat nicht Irenäus . . . die in der unbekannten zweiten Quelle kombinierten Sätze getrennt, weil er den einen schon bei Justinus vorfand, sondern Tertullian, Pseudo-Origenes und Epiphanius haben alle drei, wenn auch jeder in verschiedener Weise, die beiden sachlich so verwandten Aussagen verbunden". Finally, we may point out that Hilgenfeld, too, admits (*op. cit.*, 401) that ch. 35, in which Tert. discusses Carpocrates in exactly the same way as Simon, was certainly borrowed from Iren.

The quotation from the Acts of the Apostles (which according to Harnack (*op. cit.*, 71 and 86) was also copied by Iren. from Justin) is certainly due to Tert.'s own reading, as is shown by the following facts: a) the account given by Iren. is much more circumstantial here; b) Tert. sometimes quotes this same passage in a form as concise as is found here (*idol.* 9 (39, 7/8); *fuga* 12, 4); c) Tert. mentions Simon's repentance, which is not done by Iren. If to this we add the fact that the antithesis occurring in § 5 (Menelaus and Helen of Troy-Simon and Helen of Tyros) was certainly invented by Tert. himself, we understand how he worked up his materials. He only wished to give a more witty and attractive form to the story as related by Iren., to improve upon his source as to style, as was the usual method in classic antiquity; cf. e. g. Lucian. *histor.* 51: οὐ τί εἰπῶσι ζητητέον αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ὅπως εἰπῶσιν; W. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griech. Lit.* (Leipsic 1912), and *Mimesis im philos. und rhetor. Sinne*, Neue Jahrb. 31, 20 *seqq.*; Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 365₂; Kiessling-Heinze's

note on Hor. *ars* 133. A comparison of Tert. *Adv. Valentinianos* with the account given by Iren 1, I might show Tert.'s method still more clearly; for another example, see Borleffs, *De Tert. et Min. Fel.*, 86, ex.

Finally, we shall enumerate the details of Iren.'s report omitted by Tert. The sentence *et sustinere* (sc. summum Patrem) *vocari se quodcumque eum vocant homines* has no importance for Tert.'s account. — (Helenam) *secum circumducebat* would produce an anticlimax after the mention of the brothel. — *matrem omnium*: a title too honourable for a prostitute. — *de vase in vas* is made superfluous by the words *per alios atque alios habitus femininos*. — καὶ παθεῖν δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ δεδοικέναι καὶ μὴ πεπονθέντα: to Tert.'s story this was just as immaterial as the information that Simon to other peoples had passed himself off as the Holy Spirit.

1. The first paragraph again shows with perfect clearness that throughout this treatise the confutation of the heretics is Tert.'s main object: "Though the theory of Empedocles does not particularly interest me, no heretic having adhered to it, I nevertheless have discussed it, because this discussion may be of some use for the confutation of Pythagoras, whose doctrine was adopted by several heretics". — *Nulla*: here Tert. might have adduced Basilides, cf. e. g. Orig. in *ep. ad Rom.* 5, 1: '*Dixit enim*' inquit (sc. Basilides), '*apostolus quia 'ego vivebam sine lege aliquando', hoc est, antequam in istud corpus venirem, in ea specie corporis vixi, quae sub lege non esset, pecudis scilicet vel avis*' (for more details, see Hilgenfeld, 224/5; P. Hendrix, *De Alexandrijnsche haeresiarch Basilides* (Amsterdam 1926), 43/5; C. Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache*, T. U. 8, 1/2 (Leipsic 1892), 418; de Faye, *Gnost.*², 42/3). Basilides is mentioned by Tert. in *res.* 2 (26, 18); but as Irenaeus in his discussion of this heretic (1, 19) does not say anything about metempsychosis, Tert. does not know that he was an adherent of this doctrine. — *in hodiernum A, ad h. B.* According to Waltzing (*Ét.*, 119/20), Tert. usually writes *ad h.*, but *in h.* after (*per*)manere. Since, however, this rule is not without exceptions (e. g. *adv. Marc.* 3, 7 (388, 16/7 = *adv. Iud.* 14, 79): *atque ita in hodiernum negant venisse Christum suum*; *adv. Prax.* 22 = 269, 19/20), there is no necessity to follow B. *ad h.* does not seem to occur before Tert. (Thes. I. L. VI, 3: 2855, 22/7), whereas *in h.* (*ib.* l. 30 *seqq.*) is found from Plin. *n. h.* 33, 30 downwards. — *pavo retunderetur* certainly is the correct reading (*pavone tunderetur* B Gel); for *pavus*, see 33, 8, for *retundo* = *refuto*, 3, 3. — *metempsychosi sive metemsomatosi*: to Tert. it is immaterial which of these words the reader wishes to choose; cf. the note on 46, 5: *Aristodemus vel Aristophon*. — For *repercussa*, see the note on 23, 6, for *caederetur*, 21, 1.

2. *posteaquam* occurs once in *de anim.*, as does *postquam* (57, 5); in *de paen.* also once (6, 7), whereas *postquam* is not found there; in *de bapt.* and *ad nat.* neither word occurs. In the later period of the language *posteaquam* is not so rarely found as Hofm. (*Synt.*, 734)

says; it is preferred to *postquam* by Iren. lat., Lucif. Calaur., Rufin., Aug., Mar. Victorin., and Cassiodor. (Souter, *comm.*, 38; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 124/5). — The reading *ab ipso* should be maintained (*ab apostolo* Mercerus Kroym. Reifferscheid), but not by referring *ipso* to *spiritus sancti*, as is done by Gomperz (*Tert.*, 72). Tert. has in view the text of Act. apost. 8, 20: Πέτρος δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπωλείαν. *ipso* (= *apostolo*) refers to *apostolorum*; to this we may compare the similar use of *idem* discussed by Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 3. 11, e. g. *apol.* 9, 2: *infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulatum Tiberii, qui e o s d e m sacerdotes* (sc. “qui infantes Saturno immolabant”) *in e i s d e m arboribus templi sui obumbratricibus scelerum votivis crucibus vivos exposuit*; we may add *pall.* 5, 5. — *in interitum* (A) is the correct reading, εἰς ἀπωλείαν; *fuga* 12, 4: *pecunia tua tecum sit in interitum*. — *cum pecunia sua*: this seems to have been copied in *adv. Marc.* 4, 4 (429, 14/5): (*pecuniam*) *proiectam mox cum ipso* (sc. Marcione). — *expugnationem* = *oppugnationem*; for *exp. veritatis*, cf. *adv. Val.* 4 (181, 3/4); *apol.* 24, 2. Cf. Löfst., *Per.*, 262/3; Persson, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 150/1; Hagendahl, *Strena Upsal.*, 83₁ (for *opp.* = *exp.*, Hagendahl, *op. cit.*, 83; W. A. Baehrens, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 18/9). The earliest instance adduced by Forc. about which there is no possible doubt is Stat. *Theb.* 6, 776 (the passages adduced from Plaut. and Ter. may be excised; but perhaps we should add Cic. *Verr.* II, 1: 3, 9). In the later period of the Latin language this sense is frequently found, cf. e. g. Thielmann A. L. L. 8, 533 and Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 37. *expugnator* ‘adversary’ occurs in *ad nat.* 2, 1, 6, *expugnatorius* = *opp.* in 57, 2. — *pro solacio ultionis* “as a consolation for his punishment” (not “as a comforting revenge”): by the combating of Truth Simon gets reconciled to his punishment and his idle tears. The association of *frustra flevit* with his magic practices is not found in Iren. and so has been invented by Tert., as is also shown by the highly ironical formulation *quasi pro solacio ultionis*. — *fultus*: similarly, [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 30: *phantasiis aliquibus magicae artis fulti*. — *artis suae*: viz. magic; cf. *idol.* 9 (39, 6): *inter miracula professionis suae* (sc. Simonis); for this sense of *ars*, cf. Thes. 1. L. II: 665, 34/66; Abt, *Apol. d. Apul.*, 30/1; Hopfner, *Gr.-äq. Offenbarungszauber*, 2, 1 (§ 2). — *praestigias*: this word is often used in connection with magic, e. g. 57, 7. 12; *apol.* 22, 7; 23, 1; Hier. in *Ephes. lib.* 3, *praef.* — *virtutis*, his magic power; Simon called himself δύναμιν θεοῦ τὴν καλουμένην μεγάλην (Orig., *comm. in evang. Joh.* 1, 33, 242; Act. apost. 8, 10; [Clem.] *homil.* 2, 22 and *recogn.* 3, 47; cf. Waitz, *ZNTW* 5, 122 seq.). Tert. belittles this qualification by the addition of *alicuius*. — *de loco libidinis publicae*: similarly, *spect.* 17 (19, 2): *ipsa etiam prostibula, publicae libidinis hostiae*; *ad ux.* 2, 6: *ut de novo consistorio libidinum publicarum*; *cult. fem.* 2, 12, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 16, 12; *idol.* 11 (42, 11); *ad mart.* 2; *pall.* 4, 9. The expression seems to occur for the first time in Sen. *nat. quaest.* 1, 16, 6: *illa corpora publico obiecta ludibrio*; in later times it is found in [Cypr.] *de spect.* 6; Arnob. 2, 16; Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 33; in *Ion.* 3, 6; in *Isai.* 2, 7, etc. — *eadem pecunia*: an

addition of Tert., which, as was remarked already (p. 404), is perfectly in keeping with his usual style; moreover, it stresses the play upon the ambiguous meaning of *redimere* (*redemptor spiritus sancti* ~ *Helenam quandam eadem pecunia redemit*); for similar puns, cf. the notes on 28, 1 (*divinus*) and 32, 2 (*thamnus*). — It is unnecessary to follow Rigaltius in writing *mercem* instead of *mercedem*. If we should wish to interpret *mercedem* as equivalent to *mercem*, we might adduce many instances of this signification, e. g. the fragment of Sallustius preserved by Charisius 1, 14 (22, 10 Lindem.); Petron. 14, 2: *ergo iudicium nihil est nisi publica merces*; Sidon. Apollin. *carm.* 2, 473; cf. Tidner, *Did.*, 200₁ (for *merx* = *merces* in texts of the last period, see Wohleb, 11/2, for Apul. *flor.* 6, Norden, *Min. Fel.*, 22). The mixing up of these words in manuscripts of Tert. has been discussed by Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 94/6 (*paen.* 6, 4: *et ad mercem* (F L V Rhen.) *manum emittere; mercedem* N T.). In *paen.* 6, 5 he is certainly right in retaining the reading *mercedem* (*mercem* Latinus, Junius, and Rauschen). As this place is very similar to the passage under discussion, it may be quoted in full: *si ergo qui venditant prius nummum quo paciscuntur examinant, ne scalptus, ne versus, ne adulter, non etiam dominum credimus paenitentiae probationem prius inire, tantam nobis mercedem, perennis scilicet vitae, concessurum?* As is shown by Borleffs (*op. cit.*, 95), we must interpret here *merces* as equivalent to *praemium* (cf. also *de an.* 58, 2), though the context seems to indicate that it means 'merchandise'. In the present passage we have a similar situation: here, too, Tert. is speaking about money, and the translation 'merchandise' at first sight seems right, seeing that Simon is *redemptor spiritus sancti* as well as *redemptor Helenae*. Nevertheless, the idea is different: Simon has offered his money, has heard the hard words of St. Peter, and has wept in vain; thereupon he has turned to magic to find a consolation for his punishment. Now he obtains another consolation by purchasing Helen instead of the Power of Holy Spirit: she compensates him for not having obtained the Holy Spirit. Hence *merces* is here equivalent to *compensatio*, just as in 58, 2 and 7. The dative *sibi* does not depend on *dignam* (cf. *Thes.* 1. L. V 1: 1147, 62/75), but must be associated with *mercedem* (cf. *ib.* 1143, 69 *seqq.*).

3. *iniectionem*: ἐννοίαν, Justin *apol.* 1, 26, 3; *primam mentis eius conceptionem* Iren. (Athene as πρώτη ἐννοία τοῦ Διός, Justin, *op. cit.*, 64, 5). *iniectio* is used to translate νόημα in the quotation of 2 Cor. 2, 11 in *pud.* 13 (243, 15/6): *quoniam non ignoramus iniectiones eius (cogitationes* Vulg.; *versutias* codd. Claromont. and Boerner.; *astutias* [Cypr.] *de sing. cler.* 19; cf. Rönsch, *Sem.*, 1, 38; von Soden, 256) and *adv. Marc.* 1, 22 (318, 19); besides, it means 'objection' (ἐισβολή) in *adv. Herm.* 10 (137, 2); *adv. Marc.* 3, 21 (412, 24). 4, 1 (423, 6/7); *adv. Prax.* 27 (280, 6/7), cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 121. In Greek too ἐπιβολή sometimes means 'thought', e. g. Philo *de posterit Cain* 20 τὰς... τῆς διανοίας ἐπιβολάς; Diog. Laërt. 10, 31; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 11, 74, 1. In Lucr. 2, 740 we find *animi iniectus* as a translation of this word,

ib. 2, 1047 *animi iactus* (see Robin's note on 2, 739 and Giussani, *Studi Lucrez.*, 171/82). The influence of Lucr. may be found in Arnob. 2, 51: *quid est autem suspicio, nisi opinatio rerum incerta et in nihil expositum* (= certum) *iaculatio mentis inlata?* (for the constitution of the text, cf. W. A. Baehrens, *B Ph W* 43 (1923), 353, for the influence exercised by Lucr. on Arnob., A. Röhricht, *Die Seelenlehre des Arnob.* (Hamburg 1893), 2/21; J. Jessen, *Ueber Lucr. und sein Verhältnis zu Catull und Späteren* (Jahresber. der Kieler Gelehrtenschule, Kiel 1872), 18). For *iniectio* ∞ *iniectus*, cf. 18, 4: *deceptui* (Tp) = *deceptione*, and especially 25, 3: *ambitio* = *ambitus*. — *iniecerat*: the choice of this verb is, of course, due to *injectionem*; Irenaeus also has the *figura etymologica*: *hanc esse primam mentis eius conceptionem . . . per quam . . . mente concepit*. The original text probably contained $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu \eta \epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (not $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega \eta \epsilon\pi\epsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon$, which would imply a very singular use of $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega$ and could not be expected from so artless a stylist as Irenaeus): in the next sentence the translation has *hanc enim Ennoiam* and the same subst. is used by Justin; $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\epsilon\omega$ is frequently followed by an infin. from Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 330/1 downwards. — *compotem* = *consciam*, cf. the note on 55, 2. — *desultasse*: ironical, just as in 32, 6. — *ignaras patris, artifices mundi huius*: this correction of the text made by Hilgenfeld is certainly right, for Iren. has: *a quibus et mundum hunc factum dixit*. — *non perinde animo*: no passage from *De anima* has given rise to so many conjectures; they are, however, quite unnecessary, for the adverb *perinde* has the function of an adjective, and may be regarded as equivalent to $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. An exact parallel is furnished by 43, 10: *de iniuria perinde lateris eius* "from a similar injury to his side"; cf. the note on 1, 2: *anima tunc Socratis*. A similar use of *proinde* may perhaps be found in *adv. Val.* 6 (182, 23/4): *quorundam enim de Graeco interpretatio non occurrit ad expeditam proinde nominis formam* (Tert. has just remarked that he prefers not to translate the technical terms of the Valentinians): "for in the case of some of these terms a translation from the Greek does not arrive at a practicable form of a word corresponding <to the original>". The words are to be interpreted as an indirect remark added by Tert.: "with feelings which were not exactly adequate" (viz. to Helen's feelings towards the angels: the angels repaid Helen to whom they owed their lives by detaining her in captivity). For this use of *non perinde*, cf. e. g. Suet. *Tib.* 52: *ne mortuo quidem perinde* ("adequately, as much as this case deserved") *adfectus est* and *Vit. Terent.*: *Graecorum instituta moresque, quos non perinde exprimeret in scriptis*. — *genimina*: cf. the note on 21, 4. — *addictam*: again a juridical term; see the note on 18, 10. — *depretiatam*: a word frequently found in Tert.'s writings, cf. 17, 3. — *succidissee succedissee* A, just as 43, 5: *animam . . . nunquam succidere quieti* (Lat.; *succedere* AB); *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (350, 4/5): *qua succiderat illi* (*succederet* R¹, *succederat* F).

4. *volutatam*: cf. *revolubili*, 28, 2. — *Stesichori*: in *spect.* 9 (10, 29 seqq.) this poet is mentioned in a different context; here the name has been

borrowed from Iren. Perhaps Justin, the *philosophus Platonicus*, added this note from Plat. *Phaedr.* 243 A. As to the palinode, cf. J. J. G. Vürtheim, *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie* (Leyden 1919), 64/72; Otto, *Sprichw.*, 262; Sonny, A. L. L. 9, 73. — *reluminasset*: this verb (Tp) also occurs in *apol.* 21, 17 and *c. Chr.* 4, 32, both times in connection with *caecus*. — *migrantem*: cf. e. g. Arnob. 5, 21: (Iup-diter) *in draconis . . . formam migrat*. — *dedecoratione*: Tp; *dedecorator* (*apol.* 14, 4) is ἀ. λ.. — *titulo*: the superscription of the *cella meretricis* in the brothel, which gave the name of the prostitute: Iuven. 6, 122/3: *nuda papillis/prostitit* (sc. Messalina) *auratis titulum mentita Lyciscæ*; Petron. 7, 3; Sen. *controv.* 1, 2, 1. 5. 7; Martial. 11, 45, 1: *inscriptæ limina cellae*; Tert. *pud.* 1 (220, 8): *sub ipsis libidinum titulis*, perhaps also *ad nat.* 1, 16, 12 (the passage is not quite clear; at all events, Lohmeyer (note on Apoc. 17, 5, *Hdb. N. T.* IV, p. 139) is wrong in interpreting *titulus* there as 'fillet'). — *Helenam viliores* = *depretiatam* (§ 3); it is not necessary mentally to add an ablative *Helena pristina* or *Helena Troiana*, cf. *fuga* 12, 3: *melius fugere quam fieri viliores* ('to lose one's dignity'). Reifferscheid's conjecture *Helena viliores* makes no sense whatever. — *nescio umeris an feminibus*: an exceedingly coarse obscenity: *umeris* contains an allusion, first, to the parable of the good Shepherd, secondly, to the κελητίζειν described by Ovid *ars* 3, 775 *seqq.* and *amor.* 3, 2, 29 (H. Koch, *W Kl Ph* 35 (1918), 16/7); *reverta* too is obscene, cf. *vehatur* Ovid *ars* 3, 777. For the use of words in an ambiguous sense, see the note on 28, 1, *divinior*. Perhaps a parallel may be found in *c. Chr.* 24, 14: *ad energema Apelleiacæ virginis Philumenæ*, where the relations existing between Apelles and Philumena seem to have been made suspect in a similar way (cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 405,*). — *per vindictam* 'in due form'; for this law term, see Beck, 94, for *configuratus*, the note on 9, 8. — *et hominibus*: Gelenius and Reifferscheid write *hominibus et*; we must, however, connect the words *configuratus aequè* with *quibus fallendis*: to outwit the angels, the *pater summus* assumed the same shape, viz. the shape of an angel (Iren.: ἐξομοιοῦμενον ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις, καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις), whereas to mankind he showed himself as a human being. The inversion of *et*, which frequently occurs in Latin of the later period (cf. Löfst., *Per.*, 313; Arnob., 32₁ and 37; Spindler, 68; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 73; Blomgren, *Ammian.*, 94/8; Wistrand, 137₁; in general cf. Kroll's note on Catull. 64, 92 and Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 402/4), is altogether out of the question here. — *hominem ementitus*: for the accus. after (e)mentiri, cf. Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 192/3. In Tert.'s works it is rather frequent, e. g. *orat.* 22 (196, 4): *bene mentiris nuptam*; *iei.* 16 (295, 9): *sene mentito prophetam*; *v. v.* 14. 16. 17; *adv. Marc.* 3, 9 (392, 4); with passive sense: *ib.* 5, 18 (642, 15/6): *ab archangelo . . . mentito*; *ad nat.* 2, 12, 15; cf. also Gerlo, 2, 160. — *gesserit*, not *se gesserit* (Reifferscheid). Löfst. (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 50) refers to *adv. Marc.* 4, 23 (499, 3): *iudicem gessit*. The earliest instance of this use (for which cf. Löfst., *op. cit.*, 50₁; *Beitr.*, 104/5; *Synt.*, 1, 193; Thes. l. L. VI: 1941, 6/25; Weyman, *Christl.-lat. Poesie*, 58; Tidn., *Did.*, 206; Eriksson, 112)

occurs in Liv. *epit.* 25: *ingentem virum gessit*. Many verbs are used in the same way, e. g. *praestare* (Martial. 6, 11, 9: *ut praestem Pyladen, aliquis mihi praestet Oresten*; Verg. *Aen.* 11, 438; Suet. *Caes.* 16 and *Tib.* 33; Tert. *adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (422, 20); Hegesipp. 1, 25, 4; 1, 40, 9, etc.), *praebere* (e. g. Apul. *met.* 10, 28 (259, 2/3 H.): *talem parentem praebuit, qualem exhibuerat uxorem*), *exhibere* (Tert. *pud.* 21 (269, 21); Apul., *loc. cit.*). Cf. also *adv. Val.* 8 (186, 7/8): *cum virum fortem peroraret* (sc. Phosphorus rhetor); Prop. 4, 2, 39: *pastorem . . . curare* = “pastoris partes agere” (Rothstein).

5. To this antithesis *Helena Troiana-Helena Tyria* we may compare 36, 3: *Apelles, non pictor, sed haereticus* and 50, 4: *Quod hoc Menandri* (sc. haeretici) *balneum? Comicum credo*. — *nisi quod*: an archaism, for which cf. Langen, *Beiträge zu Plautus*, 57; Chruzander, 77; Salonijs, *Vit. Patr.*, 348/50. — *mille navibus*: the usual number in poetry from Aeschyl. *Agam.* 45 downwards (Hom. *Il.* 2: 1186, Thuc. 1, 10: 1200); in Latin literature it is found from Plaut. *Bacch.* 928 to Dracont. *Romul.* 8, 126. 646. — *cavillabundus* is quoted by Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 141) as a *ᾠ. λ.*; but Tert. certainly regarded this form as a participle, as is also shown by the parallelism (*latens, fallens*). Cf. the note on 39, 1: *animas aucupabundus*.

b) 35. *Carpocrates*.

“Besides Simon it is also Carpocrates who adheres to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. This heretic asserts that nobody’s life attains its fullness before everything that is considered sinful has been committed; <‘is considered’> for Carpocrates contends that things are never bad by nature, but only according to man’s opinion. Hence he says that human souls, as long as they have not sinned enough, must continuously enter new bodies ‘till they have paid the uttermost farthing’ (§ 1). Thus he interprets Matth. 5, 26; but there cannot be any doubt that in this passage the word ‘adversary’ denotes the heathen (§ 2). If, however, Carpocrates is right in assuming that it designs the devil, we must interpret the sentence in this way that we ought to fulfil the compact made with the devil, when at the baptismal font we renounce him, his *pompa*, and his angels (§ 3). But to return to Carpocrates — perhaps we are justified in interpreting ‘adversary’ as the sinless thoughts which thrust the soul into the ‘dungeon of the body’! (§ 4). — It is possible that such heretics also quote the case of Elias and say that he reappeared in John the Baptist, who is called ‘the new Elias’ (§ 5); but in refutation of this we may answer that Elias is still alive and, moreover, that, according to Luc. 1, 17, John the Baptist ‘shall go before the eyes of the people in the spirit and power of Elias’, but not in his soul nor in his flesh (§ 6)”.

In §§ 1/4 the source is Iren. 1, 20, 2 (which is also admitted by Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.*, 401): *Et in tantum insania effraenati sunt, uti et omnia quaecunque sunt irreligiosa et impia, in potestate habere et operari*

se dicant. Sola enim humana opinione negotia mala et bona dicunt. Et utique secundum transmigrationes in corpora oportere in omni vita, et in omni actu fieri animas: (si non praeoccupans quis in uno adventu omnia agat semel ac pariter, quae non tantum dicere et audire non est fas nobis, sed ne quidem in mentis conceptionem venire, nec credere, si apud homines conversantes in his quae sunt secundum nos civitates, tale aliquid agitur) uti, secundum quod scripta eorum dicunt, in omni usu vitae factae animae ipsorum, exeuntes, in nihilo adhuc minus habeant; adoperandum autem in eo, ne forte propterea quod deest libertati aliqua res, cogantur iterum mitti in corpus. Propter hoc dicunt Iesum hanc dixisse parabolam: 'Cum es cum adversario tuo in via, da operam, ut libereris ab eo, ne forte te det iudici et iudex ministro, et mittat te in carcerem. Amen dico tibi, non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem'. Et adversarium dicunt unum ex Angelis qui sunt in mundo, quem diabolum vocant, dicentes factum eum ad id, ut ducat eas quae perierunt animas a mundo ad principem. Et hunc dicunt esse primum ex mundi fabricatoribus, et illum altero angelo, qui ministrat ei, tradere tales animas, uti in alia corpora includat: corpus enim dicunt esse carcerem. Et id quod ait: 'Non exies inde, quoadusque novissimum quadrantem reddas', interpretantur, quasi non exeat quis a potestate Angelorum eorum, qui mundum fabricaverunt (Greek fragm., preserved by Hippol. refut. 7, 32) Εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ μετενσωματοῦσθαι φάσκουσι τὰς ψυχάς, ὅσον πάντα τὰ ἀμαρτήματα πληρῶσιν· ὅταν δὲ μηδὲν λείπῃ, τότε ἐλευθερωθεῖσαν ἀπαλλαγῇναι πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τὸν ὑπεράνω τῶν κοσμοποιῶν ἀγγέλων Θεόν, καὶ οὕτως σωθήσεσθαι πάσας τὰς ψυχάς. Εἴ τινες δὲ φθάσασαι ἐν μίᾳ παρουσίᾳ ἀναμιγῆναι πάσαις ἀμαρτίαις οὐκέτι μετενσωματοῦνται, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὁμοῦ ἀποδοῦσαι τὰ ὀφλήματα, ἐλευθερωθήσονται τοῦ μηκέτι γενέσθαι ἐν σώματι.

Tert.'s description differs from Irenaeus's much more than in the preceding chapter: in §§ 2/3 he gives his own interpretation of Matth. 5, 26, and § 4 only contains an ironical addition, so that with Irenaeus' text only a part of § 1 (*recorporari animas . . . carcerem corporis*) can be compared. On the whole Tert. here condenses his source considerably; still we find the following additions: 1) the ironical parenthesis *scilicet facinora tributa sunt vitae*; 2) the words *reliquatricem delictorum*, which repeat the preceding *quotiens minus quid intulerit*. Typical of Tert. are the words *expunctis* (cf. comm. on 22, 1) and *vitae huius commeatu* (30, 5); moreover, we may refer to the law terms *rato fieri*, *reliquatrix*, and *satisfieri*.

1. *instruxit*: for the construction of this verb, see comm. on 10, 6. — *fabulam*: cf. the note on 23, 4: *historias atque milesias*. — *inde . . . utitur*, i. e. 'de ea utitur', 'draws on it'. Cf. *adv. Herm.* 8 (135, 2): *nemo enim non eget eo, de cuius utitur*; *ib.* 9 (135, 24/5); *ad nat.* 1, 12, 11; *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (523, 12). For the substitution of *ab, de, ex, per* with a pronoun by *inde* or *unde*, see Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 299; Keil's note on *Cato agric.* 5, 3; Landgraf's note on *Cic. pro Rosc. Amer.* 74; Engelbrecht, *Wien. Stud.* 20 (1898), 295; Geyer, 25; Bellanger, 95; Bonnet, 580. — *magus*: cf. *Iren.* 1, 20, 2; *Euseb. hist. eccles.* 4, 7; Hippol.

refut. 7, 32. — **fornicarius**: *sed vitam quidem luxuriosam . . . abutuntur*. For reasons of chronology it is not at all probable that Tert. has in mind possible relations between Carpocrates and Marcellina, who, according to Iren. 1, 20, 4 (Epiphan. *haeres.* 27, 6; Aug. *de haer.* 7), belonged to his sect; in this case we might also have expected him to draw a parallel with Simon's relations to Helen. The subst. *fornicarius* (just as the verb *fornicari*) is used by Christian authors only (from *It. deuter.* 23, 17 (*Lugd.*) and *iud.* 11, 1. 16, 1 (*ib.*) downwards; cf. *Thes. l. l.* VI: 1120, 15/8; we may add Iren. *lat.* 4, 58, 9 and 5, 11, 1). — **Helena minus**: 'without Helen'. Except in the present passage, *minus* is only followed by the *ablat. mensurae* of numerals (e. g. Cic. in *Verr.* II, 1: 57, 149: *ut uno minus teste haberet*; *pro Caec.* 9, 29; Tert. *apol.* 19, 3), of pronouns connected with numerals (from Ovid *met.* 12, 554 downwards: *me minus uno*), or of numerals attached to words denoting a span of time (e. g. *Anthol. Lat.* 671, 122: *geminis anno minus . . . lustris*). For *minus esse* as an equivalent of *desse*, see Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 279 and *Festschrift f. Wackernagel* (Göttingen 1923), 333, for *minus habere* (-i) with the meaning of *deficere, vacare*, Svénn., *Compos. Luc.*, 92. — **propter . . . constituendam**: *propter* is followed by a gerundive from Varro *gramm. frag.* p. 143, 11 Willm. downwards: *propter aliud significandum* (cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 504); this use is particularly frequent in the works of Hier., Mar. Victorin., and Aug. Cf. Löfst., *Per.*, 219; Svénn., *Oros.*, 29 and *Pallad.*, 381; Tidner, *Eran.* 25 (1927), 73; Parriger, 73. — **omnimodam**: an obsolete word, re-introduced by Apul. (*met.* 5, 25; *apol.* 50), which is also found in *ad nat.* 2, 2, 5 and *apol.* 50, 10; cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 41; Goelz., *Jér.*, 169; Balmus, 71. — **istam** = *hanc*, see comm. on 1, 1. — **rato fieri**: cf. *ad ux.* 2, 8: *pater rato habet* and *adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (423, 10): *ut accepto eas faciam, ut rato habeam*; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 36/7 and Thielmann, *A. L. L.* 2, 388. — **non natura . . . opinione**: taken from Iren. § 2 (see preface to this ch.), or more likely from § 3: *per fidem enim et caritatem salvari; reliqua vero, indifferentia cum sint, secundum opinionem hominum quaedam quidem bona, quaedam autem mala vocari, cum nihil natura malum sit*. — **satisfiat**: for the conception of *satisfactio*, which plays an important part in Tert.'s works, see Kok, 105. — **revocari** is equivalent to *renasci, recenseri* (see for the last-mentioned word comm. on 40, 1); this meaning, which frequently occurs in Christian literature, is also found in *apol.* 48, 2 (F), *res.* 15 (44, 11/2), and 57 (116, 9. 17). For *habere* followed by a passive infin., see comm. on 32, 4. — **reliquatricem** (ἀ. λ.) is a law term; cf. the use of *reliquatio* in 56, 4.

2. **Huc . . . temperat**: for this use of *temperare*, cf. *pud.* 8 (235, 12/5): *quamquam . . . unum et praecipuum periculum interpretationum, ne aliorum temperetur facilitas comparationum, quam quo parabola cuiusque materia mandavit*; *res.* 2 (27, 18); *adv. Marc.* 4, 29 (522, 15); *apol.* 22, 10; A similar use of *cogere* occurs in *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 18). For this principle of exegesis we may compare *pud.* 9 (235, 25/6): *nos autem quia non ex parabolis materiam commentamur, sed ex materiis*

parabolas interpretamur. For more particulars, see d'Alès, *Théol.*, 242/54 and the monograph by Zimmermann (cf. bibliography). — *reluentem*: see comm. on 18, 4. — *simpliciter intellegendam*: cf. *ad ux.* 2, 2: *hanc monitionem . . . simpliciter intellegendo*; *ep. Barnab.* 17, 1: *in simplicitate* (ἐν ἀπλότητι) . . . *in parabolis*. Rufin., Hilar., and Hier. use the words *simplex intellectus* as a technical term for the literal ('corporalis') interpretation of Holy Scripture (e. g. Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Gen.* 7, 1; Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 1 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 4, 11/2); 95 (*ib.* 135, 5); 131 = *ib.* 245, 3). — *adversarius noster*: unlike Irenaeus, Tert. omits to quote Matth. 5, 26; he seems to suppose that every reader is acquainted with this text and knows that it contains the word *adversarius* (cf. his use of *idem*, for which see comm. on 34, 2). — *viam*: there is perhaps no reason to reject this reading of A, an accus. attached to *incedere* also occurring in *ep. Clem. lat.* 62 (57, 17 seq. Morin): *qui perpetuam vitam volunt pie et iuste incedere* and in Hier. *Reg. monach. S. Pachonii: viam sanctorum incedere*; for the underlying conception, see *fuga* 6, 1/2 with the comm. by Thierry. — *conversari*: see comm. on 9, 4; for this maxim, cf. *idol.* 14 (46, 15/6): *licet convivere cum ethnicis, commori non licet*; *pud.* 18 (260, 2); *apol.* 41, 5; Ludwig, 71/5; Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 350. — *boni animi praestes* is the correct reading, *boni animi* being a translation of Matth. 5, 25 εὐνοῶν (Gomperz, *Tert.*, 73). For the use of a qualitative genit. as an adjunct. (frequently as a translation of a Greek composite adjunct.), see Hofm., *Synt.*, 398 (e. g. Matth. 14, 31 ὀλιγόπιστε, *Vulg. modicae fidei*); from Tert. we may quote *pat.* 4 (5, 6): *probos . . . servos et bonae mentis*. For *praestare* = *se praestare*, see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 50 and *Synt.*, 1, 192/3; W. A. Baehrens, *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 413; cf. also comm. on 34, 4. — *diligite . . . vos*: according to Aalders, 38 (see also Rönsch, *N. T. T.*, 591), Tert. here quotes Matth. 5, 44; this supposition is not very plausible, for in this case we are obliged to assume that Tert. adopts the longer recension of this text, containing an interpolation from Luc. 6, 27, which has been preserved in D (see Klostermann, *Hdb. N. T.* 4, p. 50), in some manuscripts of the *It.* (*Veron.*, *Sangerm.*; see Aalders, *loc. cit.*), and in the Vulgate. It is much more probable that he inaccurately quotes Luc. 6, 27/8, which text he also quotes and discusses in *adv. Marc.* 4, 16 (*diligite inimicos vestros et benedicite eos, qui vos oderunt et orate pro eis, qui vos calumniantur*; cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 192 */3*). If Tert. had quoted Matth. 5, 44 in this passage, the omission of the words *orate pro persequentibus . . . vos* would be particularly surprising. *Maledicere* is found as a transitive verb from Petron. 58, 13 and 96, 7 downwards; cf. Löfst., *Per.*, 218; Rönsch, *It.*², 440/1; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 144; Schrijn. Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 74; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 10. — *eustodiam*: φυλακήν, *Vulg. carcerem*. Noel-dechen (*Chronol. Tert.*, 139₆) wrongly asserts that this use of *eustodia* only occurs in the treatises *de iei.* and *de pud.* (on the contrary, it is frequently found from Cic. *Verr.* II, 5: 69 downwards, see Thes. l. l. IV: 1559, 13 seqq.). — *arteris*, i. e. *cogaris*. This use of *artare* may also belong to juridical Latin; cf. e. g. *cod. Theodos.* 9, 26, 3 (= *cod. Justin.* 9, 26, 1, 1): *ad solutionem debiti primitus artetur*; for

the same use of *coartare*, see Eisele, *Ztschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung f. röm. Recht* 7, 28.

3. in diabolum: this was Carpocrates' exegesis (see the preface to this ch.; for the interpretation by the Valentinians, see Förster, *Valent.*, 89 and C. Barth, *Valent.*, 65). — **adversarii mentio**, i. e. 'the name 'adversary''; see comm. on 13, 1. This very common interpretation (which probably is the right one, see Klostermann, *Hdb. N. T.*, 4, 45 and the notes by Windisch on 1 Petr. 5, 8 and by Knopf on 1 Clem. 51, 1) was especially favoured by Origen, e. g. in *Matth. frag.* 102 I and 349; *caten. frag.* 67 in *Matth.* 4, 10; cf. Wutz, *Onom. sacra*, 134 seq. Arnobius iun. (in *Matth.* 6 = *Anecd. Mareds.* III, 3: 137, 5/10) interprets *adversarius* as *homo exterior*. — **ex observatione comitante:** at first sight the conjecture by Gomperz *comitantem* is very tempting, cf. e. g. *orat.* 29 (200, 1): *hostem* (= diabolum) *qui nos undique observat*; *paen.* 7, 9; Gregor. Nyss. *de anim. et resurr.* 238 B: ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τοῦ συνοικούντος ἡμῶν τῇ ζωῇ πολεμίου. It should, however, be considered that it is not easy to explain the use of *ex*, if we follow Gomperz, and, moreover, that Tert. has a predilection for personifications (see comm. on 14, 2). So it seems advisable to translate: "Further, when the word 'adversary' is referred to the devil because of his spying, which never lets us be". — **pactus es:** baptism is frequently represented as a *negotium* between God and man, e. g. *bapt.* 8; *prud.* 12 (242, 19; cf. Beck, 50. 105); Caspari, *Kirchenhist. Anecd.*, p. 202: *vos . . . qui in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti ad baptismum accessistis, considerate quod in ipsum baptismum pactum fecistis*. To my knowledge, the interpretation given in this passage only recurs in Hier. *ep.* 130, 7, 14 and *comm. in Ps.* 9 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 1: 23, 1 seqq.). — The reading given by A, viz. *renuntiassse*, may be retained: the perfect infin. expresses quite clearly the irrevocability of the renouncing of the devil. Exact parallels are found in the following passages: *spect.* 4 (6, 2/4): *cum aquam ingressi Christianam fidem in legis suae verba profiteamur, renuntiassse nos diabolo et pompae et angelis eius ore nostro contestamur*; *Cypr. ep.* 13, 5 (508, 13 H.): *saeculo renuntiaveramus cum baptizati sumus* (cf. Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 41); *de zelo et liv.* 11 (426, 8 H.): *quid ad diabolum cui renuntiaveras redis?*; *de lapsis* 8 (242, 24); *de hab. virg.* 6 (191, 23 H.; see Merckx, 119). We may, moreover, observe that Tert. frequently uses a perfect infin. instead of a present infin. after a perf. or a pluperf.; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 53/4 and *Beitr.*, 40; Rönsch, *It.*², 431/2; Hofm., *Synt.*, 591/2 (these authors only quote instances of a perfect infin. after the perf. or pluperf. of auxiliary verbs; however, cf. *de test. anim.* 5 (142, 2): *sumsisse et tradidisse contigit*). For the conception of *renuntiare* (ἀποτάσσεσθαι), see Reitzenstein, *Hist. monach.*, 104. 125₁. 258; Schlier, 146; Achelis, 2, 91₂. — **pompae:** for this word see my article 'Pompa diaboli', *Vigiliae Christianae* 1 (1947), 15/43. — **eierasti:** Tert. seems to be the only author to use this verb referring to the *renuntiatio diaboli*; see J. Köhne, *Die Schrift Tert.'s „Ueber die Schauspiele"*, etc. (Münster i. W. 1929), 24/5; Dölger, *Sonne der Gerecht.*,

119/20. — **transgressorem**: Tp, and a 'Christianism' (a translation of Gr. παραβάτης); see Mohrm., *Aug.*, 210, Goelz, *Jér.*, 51, Cooper, 65, and my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 70. — **eriminatorum**: this word contains an allusion to Apoc. 12, 10; cf. Thes. l. L. IV: 1196, 70/9; Rufin. *apol.* 1, 19; Eucher. *instruct.* 2 (155, 17/9 Wotke); Hier. *in Tit.* 2, 8; c. *Rufin.* 2, 7; Iren. *Epideixis* 16. — de . . . **delatorem**: *adv. Marc.* 2, 10 (348, 8): *diabolus, id est delator*; *ib.* 5, 18 (642, 13/4); Lactant. *epit.* 22 (27), 6 (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 416, 70/4); Cyrill. Hieros. *catech.* 2, 4: διάβολος . . . ἐκ τῆς πράξεως λαβὼν τὴν προσηγορίαν (cf. the note by Reischl); Ruricius *ep.* 2, 13 (393, 1/2 Eng.); Clem. Alex. *strom.* 3, 4, 38, 3; [Justin] *Cohort. ad gent.* 28; *Hist. Lausiaca* p. 69, 10 Butler, etc.; see also Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 38. — **angelo executionis** (Vulg. *ministro*): see comm. on 53, 6. — **mora resurrectionis**: for this conception, see the note on 58, 8.

4. **Ceterum ad Carpoeraten**: after the digression in §§ 2/3 about the right interpretation of Matth. 5, 26 Tert. returns to his theme. We may compare 44, 1: *Ceterum de Hermotimo* (there Tert. fears that his discussion of sleep might become too circumstantial, just as his treatment of Matth. 5, 26 in the present passage, and hastens to pass on to a new subject). According to Löfstedt (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 87), *ad* is equivalent here to *apud* (see also Väänänen, 21): 'si apud C. - en omnium facinorum debitor anima est'. However, the interpretation just given is also supported by 50, 1: *nunc ad originem huius excessus*; for some similar cases, see Vahlen, *Philol. Schr.*, 1, 570. — **debitrix**: another law term (which in this chapter are particularly numerous) also occurring in *scorp.* 8 (162, 9): *debitricem martyrii fidem*. — **ex malis . . . intellegi**: this sentence is the outcome of Tert.'s polemics against Marcion; see comm. on 21, 4. — **malis . . . pessimis**: this is indeed intended as a climax (see the note on 41, 3). — **doctrinam veritatis**: see comm. on 17, 12: *sententiam veritatis*.

5. **Spero**: 'I expect'. The same meaning occurs in 56, 6; *adv. Iud.* 7, 3; *cult. fem.* 2, 12, 3; in *pall.* 4, 3 (*quod apud Omphalen balsamo aut telino spero factum*; *credo et iubas pectinem passas*) the sense is more like *puto*, whereas in 33, 11, *pall.* 2, 4, and *paen.* 12, 2 the verb is almost equivalent to *timeo*. For the last-mentioned sense, cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 1, 543; Verg. *ecl.* 8, 26 (with the note by Servius); *Aen.* 2, 658; 10, 291 (Ribbeck); 11, 275. 437; *Ciris* 431. For further details, see e. g. Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 77; Forcellini s. v. *spero*; Landgraf's note on Cic. *pro Rosc. Amer.* 10. — **invadere exemplum**: see comm. on 26, 3. — **repraesentati**: see the note on 57, 12. — **patrocinetur pronuntiatio domini** (B Gel) must be the correct reading; cf. 32, 10; *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 16/7): *de simplici capitulo dominicae pronuntiationis*; *fuga* 6, 1; *scorp.* 9 (164, 26/7); *res.* 62 (123, 13); *bapt.* 2, 3 and 12, 1, etc. When following A (*patrocinentur praenuntio domini*), we get an ablat. which is not easy to explain; moreover, *praenuntius* is very seldom used as a designation of St. John the Baptist (to my knowledge, only in Ambros. *de fide* 4, 1, 4; *praeminister* is used by

Tert. in *orat.* 1 = 180, 20). — The opinion that John the Baptist was a reincarnation of Elias, is indeed found in Gnostic writings. Cf. *Pistis Sophia* p. 222, 6 *seqq.*: *Dico tibi, nullum prophetam venisse ad lumen . . . et cum venissem ad τόπον αἰώνων, Heliam vertens misi in σῶμα Iohannis βαπτίστου, reliquos δὲ quoque converti in σώματα δίκαια, repertura μυστήρια luminis, ut profecti in altitudinem κληρονομήσωσι regnum lucis*; the 'book of Jeu' (C. Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache*, T U VIII 1 (Leipsic 1892), 433); Basilides quoted in *Exc. ex Theodoto* 28; see also Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 213 and 225. Still it is not sure that Tert. in the present passage has certain heretics in mind; the use of *spero* makes it probable that he knew no instances of this Gnostic theory, but feared that such an interpretation of Matth. 17, 12 might crop up in the future and so refuted it *a priori*. Origenes frequently mentions this exegesis, e. g. *comm. in Matth.* XIII, 1 (p. 172, 27 *seqq.*): 'Ἐν τούτοις (viz. Matth. 17, 12) Ἡλίας οὐχ ἡ ψυχὴ <Ἡλίου> δοκεῖ μοι λέγεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ ἐμπίπτω εἰς τὸ ἀλλότριον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῆς μετενσωματώσεως δόγμα; in *Matth. tom. VII frag. (Apol. Pamphili, 24, 405 Lomm.)*: *quidam quidem opinati sunt ex eo quod dictum est 'ipse est Elias qui venturus est' animam Eliae eandem fuisse quam Ioannis . . . et ex hoc paene solo sermone dogma introduxerunt μετενσωματώσεως id est transmutationis animarum*; *comm. in Ev. Ioh.* 6, 10, 64: Τάχα τούτῳ χρήσονται οἱ ἐκ τούτων τῶν περὶ μετενσωματώσεως παριστάμενοι λόγῳ, ὥς τῆς ψυχῆς μεταμφιευνμένης σώματα καὶ οὐ πάντως μεμνημένης τῶν προτέρων βίων. οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ οὗτοι ἐροῦσι καὶ τινὰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν δόγματι συγκατατιθεμένων περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰρηκέναι ὥς ἄρα εἷς τις εἴη τῶν ἀρχαίων προφητῶν ἀναστὰς οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν μνημείων ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως (cf. Luc. 9, 19); *ib.* 6, 12, 73: εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἡγνοεῖτο ἡ ἐκ Ζαχαρίου γένεσις Ἰωάννου, ἔπεμπον δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων Ἰουδαῖοι διὰ τῶν Λευιτῶν καὶ ἱερέων πευσόμενοι τὸ, Σὺ Ἡλίας εἶ; δῆλον ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγον τὸ περὶ μετενσωματώσεως δόγμα οἰόμενοι εἶναι ἀληθὲς ὥς πάτριον τυγχάνον καὶ οὐκ ἀλλότριον τῆς ἐν ἀπορρήτοις διδασκαλίας αὐτῶν. From later authors we may quote [Orig.] *tract. de s. script.* 2 (19,5 *seqq.* Batiffol-Wilmart): *Ioannem Baptistam ipsum esse Eliam, non propter carnis materiam, sed propter unam eandemque virtutem spiritus*; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 88 (449 C): *In virtute Eliae. Nemo cum hoc audit, μετεμψύχωσιν imputet: hic spiritum dicit illum, quem per divinam gratiam meruit, non quem carnis est consecutus ad vitam; et virtutem dicit illam quam de supernis habuit, non illam quam propter corporis adeptus est firmitatem*; Aug. *Quaest. in Num.*, qu. 18: *sicut de Iohanne dictum est: in spiritu et virtute Eliae. Non enim anima Eliae in eum fuerat revoluta* (for this word, cf. *comm.* on 28, 2): *quod si quidam haeretica perversitate opinantur, quid dictum sunt in eo quod scriptum est: Spiritus Eliae requievit super Elisaeum*. Besides, it should be noted that in *mon.* 8 *ex.* Tert.'s own words are ambiguous: *non enim aliud fuit Helias quam Ioannes qui in virtute et spiritu venit Heliae* (cf. also Aug. *de trin.* 5, 14, 15). — **Iudaei ex opinione Pythagorica:** cf., however, the passages just quoted from Origen. The question *tu es Helias?* might indeed be put by an adherent of metempsychosis, whereas the *praedicatio*

divina: “*et ecce ego mittam . . .*” makes any association with this idea impossible.

6. *illorum*, viz. *eorum qui Pythagoran sequuntur* (to be supplied from the preceding *opinione Pythagorica*). — *morte functae*: this expression is found from Ovid *met.* 11,583 downwards; Tert. often uses it (e. g. 55, 2; *pud.* 18 (261, 15); *res.* 36 (78, 23/4) and 58 = 119, 9); cf. Thes. I. L. VI: 1589, 62 *seqq.* — *decessione*: this passage seems to be the first where *decessio* (here still connected with the genit. *vitae*) means ‘death’; cf. Thes. I. L. V, 1: 161, 21 *seqq.* — *translatione*: see 50, 5. — *restituendus . . . reddendus*: Tert. seems to be the first author to use the gerundive with the function of a fut. part. of the pass. (according to Wack. (*Synt.*, 1, 289/90), Hor. *ep.* 1, 1, 1: *prima dicte mihi, summa dicende Camena* and Liv. 21, 21, 8 may be regarded as transitional cases). Cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 54/5, Hofm., *Synt.*, 556. 597. 604, and the monograph by T. Odelstierna, *De vi futurali ac finali gerundii et gerundivi Latini observationes* (thes. Upsala 1926). — *ex postliminio vitae*: another law term (also in *pud.* 15 (250, 23): *p. . . ecclesiasticae pacis*); in a similar context Apul. *met.* 2, 28 (48, 6/7 Helm): *corpusque istud p.-o mortis animare*; *ib.* 10, 12 (245, 16/8): *discusso mortifero sopore surgentem p.-o mortis filium*; *florid.* 19 (40, 15/6 H.): *atque ita vispillonum manibus extortum velut ab inferis p.-o domum rettulit*; Lact. *div. inst.* 7, 22, 13: *si quis ab inferis rediens vitam p.-o recepisset*; Zeno Veron. 1, 1, 5: *mortuorum in p.-um vitae animas reductas inspira*. — *idem et ipse*: these words are here put in juxtaposition to exclude every doubt about the identity. We may compare *apol.* 48, 4: (in resurrectione) *idem ipse, qui fuerat, exhibebitur*; *res.* 57 (116, 8): *si . . . ipsa eademque substantia revocatur*; *ib.* (118, 6/7): *ita manebit quidem caro etiam post resurrectionem eatenus passibilis, qua ipsa, qua eadem*; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 104, and for the use of *idem ipse* in the succeeding centuries (which has nothing to do with the passages we have just discussed), Thes. I. L. VII, 1: 202, 74 *seqq.*, Salon., *V. P.*, 236; Norberg, 1, 140; Linderbauer, 252 and 386. — *et sui nominis et sui hominis*: according to Hoppe, *loc. cit.*, *idem* designs the name, *ipse* the person; this is possible, but cannot be satisfactorily proved. *Sui nominis*: for he will come back as ‘Elias’, not as ‘John the Baptist’. Cf. *res.* 7 (35, 4/6): *sic et figulo licet argillam . . . in materiam robustiorem recorporare . . . aptiorem pristina et sui iam generis ac nominis*. For another meaning of *sui nominis*, e. g. *SH A, Vita Commodi* 17, 11: *Severus . . . vir nominis sui* (‘a man who was a credit to his name’), cf. my observations, *Mnemos*, III ser., 11 (1943), 77; = ὁμώνυμος e. g. *Serv. ad Aen.* 1, 505: *Chelonen in animal sui nominis vertit* (sc. Mercurius). — *sui hominis*: ‘with his own personality’, *suae carnis suaeque animae* (this interpretation finds support in the words *non in anima eius nec in carne*) or ‘with his own human figure’, so that the greater stress is laid upon the corporeal identity (since for adherents of metempsychosis there existed no doubt about the identity of the soul; hence the words *non in anima eius nec in carne* in the next sentence are not quite exact, for Tert.’s opponents would never have asserted that St. John appeared

in carne Heliae). For the second possibility a parallel is furnished by Apul. *met.* 4, 1, where Lucius desires to get rid of his ass's body and to *resurgere in hominem*, to recover his human body (for the possess. pron. in *sui hominis*, cf. *ib.* 7, 15 (165, 14 H.): *asino meo* (the same *ib.* 9, 13 (213, 4); 11, 16 (278, 16); 10, 29 (260, 12): *priori meo Lucio*; 11, 2 (267, 23): *redde me meo Lucio*); cf. also Asclep. 37: *eius . . . mundanus homo, id est corpus*). At all events, the expression *sui hominis* is partly due to christologic formulations, for *eius* (sc. Christi) or *suus homo* is sometimes used to denote the human nature of Christ; mostly (at least before the dogmatic disputes of the fourth century) this is practically equivalent to *corpus Christi*. Cf. e. g. Priscillian. *tract.* 6 (74, 8/9 Schepss): *deus noster . . . formam in se dei et hominis, id est divinae animae et terrenae carnis adsignans*; from Tert.: *c. Chr.* 17, 29: *si terreni non fuit census homo eius*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 10 (448, 5/6): *Iudaei solummodo hominem eius intuentes*; *ib.* 3, 6 (386, 2/4); 5, 9 (602, 10/2); *adv. Prax.* 27 (279, 23 *seqq.*); from later authors e. g. Optat. Milev. 1, 1: *qui . . . secundum hominem suum per Mariam virginem natus sit*; *ib.* 6, 3; Cassian. *c. Nestor.* 7, 17, 3: *sed ita tamen conceptum corpus cooperante spiritu dicimus, ut creatum tamen sibi a filio dei hominem suum esse dicamus*; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 14 (154, 12 Batiff.-Wilm.); Novat. *de trin.* 21. 23 (cf. C. Weyman, *Hist. Jahrb.* 21 (1900), 215/6); Eucher. *instruct.* 1, *de Luca* 9 (113, 23/4 Wotke). The expression *suscipere hominem* (referring to Christ) was for a long time considered as an 'Africanism'; this was rightly contested by G. Morin, *Rev. Bénéd.* 15 (1898), 99 *seqq.* Arnobius even uses *homo* (without the addition of *eius* or *suus*) as strictly equivalent to *corpus* (1, 55: *animis hominibusque*; *ib.* 62 and 65; 2, 28: *(animae) foris positae ac nondum hominibus coniugatae*). So in passages dealing with metempsychosis or with the human nature of Christ we find *homo* possessing the sense of 'human being', 'human existence', and in process of becoming a synonym of *corpus*, the idea of the soul entering the body from without lying at the root of either case (we must, however, carefully examine every relevant passage to see whether more stress is laid on the fact of the soul having come from without or on the fact that by its entrance into the body a new being is created). As a third cause for this use of *homo* in Tert.'s works we may regard his tendency to check an overrating of the soul. For this tendency, cf. e. g. 40, 3: *nec ita caro homo tamquam alia vis animae*; 51, 4: *corporis . . . quod et ipsum homo*; *res.* 16 (47, 2/3): *ille scilicet limus, qui prior titulo hominis incisus est*; 26 (62, 4 *seqq.*). *Ib.* 40 (83, 5/6) body and soul are represented as of equal importance in the denomination 'homo' (cf. also *ib.* 2 (28, 12/3); *pud.* 19 (262, 19/20): *haereticus . . . per baptisma utroque homine (nomine Latin. Reiff) purgatus*; *ib.* 20 (268, 4/8; *adv. Prax.* 30 = 287, 12/3). — *sui cuiusque sunt hominis*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 4 (294, 29): *in suis quibusque regionibus*. — *non in anima eius nec in carne*: for Elias will come back *in anima et in carne sua*; this explains the addition of *in carne*, which strictly speaking is superfluous here (see the first part of the note on *sui hominis*). — *spiritus . . . extrinsecus*: as discussed in detail in ch. 11. The relation

between Elias and John the Baptist is explained by Origenes (*comm. in evang. Joh.* 6, 11, 66) in exactly the same way: 'there was only a transmittance of πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις; <I assert this> διὰ μυρίων δυνάμενος ἀποδεικνύναι γραφῶν ἕτερον εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ὀνομαζομένην δύναμιν τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς'. — *de Mosei spiritu*, viz. in Num. 11, 17: *et auferam de spiritu tuo, tradamque eis*. As forms of the genit. Tert. has *Mosei* (also 37, 2 and 57, 7), *Moysis* (e. g. *adv. Iud.* 2, 86 P N F R), and *Moysei* (e. g. *pat.* 5 (9, 21) and *adv. Marc.* 1, 10 = 303, 7); in the present passage the choice was of course determined by the clausula. See for these forms Hartel, A. L. L. 3, 35; Hoogterp, 23; Lavarenne, 17; Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 61; Archambault's note on Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 16, 1. The two scriptural passages quoted in this paragraph were also associated with each other by Aug. *de trin.* 5, 14, 15.

36. *The sex of the soul.*

"After this digression about the migration of souls, I return to my discussion of the simultaneous genesis of body and soul [ch. 27] (§ 1). According to this theory, the soul must needs receive its sex at the same time as the body (§ 2). Apelles the heretic, however, asserts that the souls already possess a definite sex before their entrance into the body; on the other hand, those who think that this entrance takes place after birth contend that it is the flesh which gives its sex to the soul (§ 3). There cannot be any doubt that the sex is the result of the fusion of the semen of the body and that of the soul. — When the male embryo reaches its complete form before the female, we may once again state the influence of the *primordiorum forma*, for Adam was created before Eve. When Eve lay for some time as 'formless flesh', she nevertheless already possessed a soul; otherwise God would have brought her to life through His breath, as He did Adam (§ 4)".

In this chapter Tert.'s first aim is not to discuss the question whether the soul has a definite sex, but rather to preclude the possibility of denying the simultaneous genesis of body and soul on the ground of theories like the one maintained by Apelles. That this is the chief motive indeed, is shown clearly by the fact that in § 3 the Stoics (*qui animam post partum carni superducunt utique ante formatae*; see the note on 25, 2) are joined on to Apelles, not because they ever thought of attributing a definite sex to the soul (at all events, we never hear anything about this), but only on account of their doctrine about the genesis of the soul at birth, which (but this is only added to obtain a contrast to the view of Apelles) might have led to the conclusion that the soul receives its sex from the body (the indicative *praeiudicant* does not refer to an existing theory, but only indicates a conclusion drawn by Tert. himself; for a similar practice, cf. the note on 35, 5 and the preface to ch. 55, p. 557). In other words: Tert. is only interested in the theory of Apelles, because it must have proceeded from the conviction that the soul comes into existence before the

body, whereas the Stoic view interests him for its own sake. So the entire discussion (which contains nothing not thought out by Tert. himself) must be regarded as a continuation of ch. 27.

Such Christian writers as have expressed their opinion about the subject discussed in the present chapter regard the soul as sexless; we may adduce the following passages: Athenag. *de resurr.* 23 (76, 19/20 Schwartz): οὐκ οὔσης ἐν αὐταῖς (viz. ταῖς ψυχαῖς) τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ διαφορᾶς; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 4, 8, 60, 1; *ib.* 3, 13, 93, 3 (Clement here attacks Cassianus the heretic): ἀποστᾶσα γὰρ τοῦδε τοῦ σχήματος, ᾧ διακρίνεται τὸ ἄρρεν καὶ τὸ θῆλυ, ψυχὴ μετατίθεται εἰς ἑνωσιν, οὐδέτερον οὔσα; *paedag.* 1,4, 10; Cyrill. Hieros. *catech.* 4, 20: καὶ ὅμοιαι πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ εἰσιν ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν· τὰ γὰρ μέλη τοῦ σώματος διακέκριται μόνον; *Narratio Zosimi* 14 (M. R. James, *Apocr. Anecd.*, 1 (Cambridge 1893), 105, 23/5): ἡμεῖς δὲ θεωροῦμεν τὸ εἶδος τῆς ψυχῆς ὡς εἶδος φωτὸς πεπληρωμένην καθ' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος χωρὶς τοῦ ἄρσενος καὶ τῆς θηλείας. It is evident that from these passages we must discriminate such as refer to the abolition of the difference of sex in the hereafter, as for instance Matth. 22, 30 and the fragment of the 'Egyptian gospel' preserved by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 3, 13, 92 (who nevertheless refers to it in the passage just quoted): πυθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο ἔφη ὁ κύριος: 'ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἐνδύμα πατήσητε καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἐν καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ (cf. Wilamowitz, *Götting. gel. Anz.* 166 (1904), 664); cf. also the statement by Basilides (*Hippolyt. refut.* 5, 8, 44 = p. 97, 14 *seqq.* Wendland) that neither ψυχικοὶ nor σαρκικοὶ are admitted to the house of God, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικοῖς μόνοις, ὅπου δεῖ γενομένους βαλεῖν τὰ ἐνδύματα καὶ πάντας γενέσθαι νυμφίους ἀπηρεσινωμένους διὰ τοῦ παρ-θενικοῦ πνεύματος, and 2 Clem. 12, 2. According to the Κόρη κόσμου (*Stob. ecl.* 1, 49 = I: 410, 1 *seqq.* Wachsmuth), the souls are οὔτε . . . ἄρρενες οὔτε θήλειαι, but the soul of woman is δίνυγρος . . . καὶ τρυφερά, whereas those of men are τραχεῖαι καὶ ἐργατικώτεραι; cf. Scott's note, III, 568 (such passages as Philo *spec. leg.* 3, 178 and *leg. alleg.* 2, 97 must be interpreted in the same way; as for *Poimandres* p. 4, 17 Parthey: ὁ δὲ Νοῦς . . . ἀρρενόηλος ὢν, see Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 52 *seqq.* and 239₂; Reitzenstein, *ARW* 7 (1904), 398 *seqq.*; Norden, *Agn. Theos*, 229/30; Scott, II, 45). The Stoic 'diatribe' emphasizes the psychic equality of men and women (Muson. p. 8 *seqq.* Hense), just as Theodorus of Asine (*Procl. in Plat. Remp.* 1, p. 253 *seqq.* Kroll). The presocratic philosophers, when discussing the genesis of sex, only considered the body (Emped. A 81; Parmenides A 53; Anaxagoras A 107; Democritus A 143). The same holds good for medical literature, e. g. [Hippocr.] Π. διαίτης 1,27; Galen. *de semin.* 2, 5 and *de usu part.* 14, 7.

1. inde: viz. ch. 27. — revertendum: cf. 25, 1: *Iam . . . excessus* and the note. — unum . . . semen: 27, 9; a *primordio*: 27, 8. To *unum . . . semen* we must, of course, mentally supply *animae* from the preceding *animam*. — generis, sc. *humani*: cf. the note on 20, 6. — examen:

cf. the note on 23, 4, to which we may add Min. Fel. 23, 9: *Saturnum, principem huius generis et examinis*. — **propter**, etc.: here Tert. frankly states the principal motive for his argument in ch. 27. — **aemulas** = *contrarias* (cf. the note on 2, 5). — **illum . . . veterosum**: an ironical repetition of 28, 1: *Quis ille nunc vetus sermo apud memoriam Platonis...*? — **sequentium exinde**: cf. 37, 3: *exinde reliquorum*.

2. **esset . . . adscribere**: *est* with the meaning of *licet* and followed by an infin. is originally only found in the expression *est videre* (Mumm. *Atell.* frag. 1, Varro, *Lucr.*), cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 583. Tert. is the first to connect it with a passive infin. (Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 19/20 and *Synt.*, 47; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 1, 51). — **insculperet**: no other instances of a similar use of this verb seems to be known (*apol.* 35, 7 and *iei.* 5 (279, 7/8) cannot be compared).

3. **quoniam**: Reifferscheid unnecessarily writes *quomodo*; the theory of Apelles gives an explanation of the last words of § 2, *ut . . . anima carni insculperet sexum*: "for, when thinking, like Apelles, that the soul already existed before birth as a male or a female being, we cannot but assume that the flesh owes its sex to the soul". Cf. the introducing of an example by means of *siquidem* in 47, 2. — **non pictor, sed haereticus**: cf. the note on 34, 5. — **sicut . . . didicit**: similarly, *praescr.* 30, 25/6: *quae ab ea* (Ph.) *didicit* 'φανερώσει' *ascripsit* (Apelles); *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (393, 15): *persuasit Appelli*. For Philumene (not Philomena: *praescr.* 6, 19 and 30, 23; *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (393, 15); *c. Chr.* 6, 7/8 and 10), cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 177/8 and 404 */12 *; Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 531; de Faye, *Gnost.*, 178 and 187/8; for Apelles, see the comm. on 23, 3. Concerning the doctrine of Apelles mentioned in the present passage we possess no other evidence. — **Et qui**, etc.: probably Tert. is thinking of the Stoics; cf. 25, 2 and the end of the preface to this ch. — **superdueunt**: cf. the note on 25, 6. — **marem aut feminam . . . sexum**: when having the function of adjectives, *mas* and *femina* are usually attached to substantives denoting persons (especially *filius*, *homo*, and *deus*), animals, and plants (Thes. 1. L. VI: 462, 30/464, 23; for the use made of these words in grammar, see *ib.* 464, 24/52); thus in Tert. *ad nat.* 2, 12, 2: *mares* (sc. *deos*) *an et feminas?* (*apol.* 10, 5: *masculos feminas*); *adv. Val.* 10 (189, 3); (in *pall.* 3, 2: *hyaena, si observes, sexus annalis est, marem et feminam alternat* it seems hardly right mentally to add *sexum* to *feminam*). When connected with other substantives, these words commonly have a metaphorical sense (e. g. *Apul. met.* 3, 5: *maribus animis et viribus alacribus...* *ib.* 8, 11: *masculis animis impetuque diro*); hence we may regard the present passage as an exceptional case.

4. **suffusio**: 'fusion' (mostly = *infusio*, e. g. *Apic.* 1, 1 and *Pallad.* 1, 35, or denoting diseases of eyes or feet in animals). — **communem . . . eventum**: since neither of them causes the origin of a definite sex (for *eventus*, see the note on 2, 1), they 'undergo' it 'as a fact that concerns both of them'; the active force is here a somewhat

mysterious (*quaecumque illa est*) *ratio naturae*. This sentence shows that the question of the origin of sex was not of paramount importance for Tert. (see the preface to this ch.). — *generis* = *sexus*, cf. Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 1895, 35/61 (Tert.: *v. v.* 5: *generis feminini*). — *lineas* . . . *duxerit*: cf. 43, 11: *humani . . . initii ac finis lineas agere*, and the note on 26, 1. — *quaecumque*: cf. 37, 1: *quancumque illam rationem agitare sortita*. — *primordiorum forma*: 'the example given in Genesis'; see the comm. on 29, 2. — *cum masculus . . . serius*: the common view of Greek medicine, e. g. Galen XVII A, 1006 Kühn: καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὠμολόγηται σχεδὸν ἅπασι τοῖς ἱατροῖς οὐ μόνον διαπλάττεσθαι θᾶττον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κινεῖσθαι τὸ ἄρρεν τοῦ θήλεος. εἴρηται δὲ περὶ τούτων σαφῶς καὶ τῷ περὶ φύσεως παιδίου ([Hippocr.] *de nat. inf.* 21) ὥστερ γε καὶ παρὰ Διοκλεῖ κατὰ τὰ περὶ γυναικείων συγγράμματα (frag. 176 Wellm.); Hippocr., *op. cit.*, 18; Galen. IV, 631 Kühn; Empedocles *ap.* Oribas. 3, 78 (Diocles frag. 175 Wellm.); Diogen. Apollon. (Wellm., *loc. cit.*); Asclepiades (Aët. 5, 21, 2); Athenaeus (Wellm., *Die pneumatische Schule*, 152). — *temperius*: it is quite unnecessary to write *temporius* (Rigaltius), for *temperius* occurs fairly frequently, e. g. Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 9, 16, 8; Ovid *met.* 4, 198; Apul. *met.* 9, 26. — *prior enim Adam*: an allusion to 1 Tim. 2, 13. — *Adae*: the declined form of the genit. from Tert. (e. g. 43, 10; *v. v.* 7, etc.) and Iren. lat. downwards gradually supersedes the undeclined; cf. Thes. l. L. I: 563, 79 *seqq.* — *tunc* has adjectival function (see the comm. on 1, 2: *anima tunc Socratis*). — *animam* is equivalent to ζῷον (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 32/3; cf. Wack., *Synt.*, 2, 270), but it should be noted that the word was deliberately chosen to denote that Eve was not only *caro informis*. Tert. fears that his theory of the simultaneous genesis of body and soul will be endangered, so in the next sentence he emphasizes the fact that Eve owed her soul as well as her body to Adam (and so was never 'formless flesh' only). — *Ceterum . . . femina*: cf. *res.* 7 (34, 20/3): *cum aliquanto prius et Adam substantiae suae traducem in feminae iam carne recognoverit — hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro ex carne mea*; Hier. c. Ioann. Hieros. 22: *si insufflatio dei (quod non vis, et quod nunc relinquis ambiguum) humanae animae conditio est: Eva, in cuius faciem non insufflavit deus, unde animam habuit?* Vincentius Victor seems to have used the same scriptural text to prove his traducianism; it is highly probable that he took it from the present chapter (cf. Introduction, p. 48*). Cf. the confutation of his view by Augustine (who also must have known this passage, as in *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 26, 44 he quotes *an.* 37, 6/7) in *de an. et ei. orig.* 1, 18, 29 (see also *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 1, 1. 2; *ib.* 3, 4 and 10, 17). Moreover, we may quote [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.* 23 (shortly before the author had condemned traducianism): *nam si eo tempore quo seminatur corpus, etiam anima generatur ex anima, de Adam costam sublatam legimus, non tamen animam natam ex anima: sed si costa secum habuit animam, iam non nata est, sed detracta in partem. sed nec hoc scriptum est, etc.*

37. *Additional details about the condition of the soul before birth; its growth after birth.*

"The formation of man in the womb is watched over by a power subservient to God's will; for the performance of this, the superstition of the Romans assumed the existence of special Gods, whereas we Christians know of no other servants of God than the angels (§ 1). — The embryo deserves to be called a human being from the very moment of attaining its final form (the proof is furnished by Exod. 21, 22/3) (§ 2). — As a rule birth takes place at the beginning of the tenth month of pregnancy. The symbolism of numbers teaches us that the number ten is the 'mother' of all succeeding numbers, so that it may also be regarded as 'the power perfecting human birth' (§ 3). I for one would rather see in it a reference to the decalogue; and since children are frequently born in the seventh month, I associate this fact with the sabbath: it was on the seventh day that God's creation was initiated, and it is in the seventh month that man, his image, often enters human life; moreover, the number seven is a symbol of the first resurrection and of the kingdom of Christ. On the other hand, children born in the eighth month cannot live; for eight is the number denoting eternity, and in eternity 'there shall be no marrying' (Matth. 22, 30) (§ 4). — We have already pointed out that flesh and soul are closely connected with each other from the moment of conception; of course this also applies to the time after birth, first of all because they grow together, though in a different way. For the growth of the soul does not affect its substance (if this were the case, it might also be able to decrease, and then it would be mortal), but the sum total of all its natural faculties develops gradually together with the flesh (§ 5). In the same way, a nugget of gold or silver, when beaten by the goldsmith, becomes larger than it was, though nothing is added to its substance (§ 6). By that process its lustre, too, is enhanced, but the only new thing it obtains, is the shape. We may consider the growth of the soul in the same way: it does not affect its substance, but only brings out its faculties (§ 7)".

In this chapter with its variegated contents Tert. must have made use of different sources. It seems hardly probable that for the first part Soranus was largely consulted, as Karpp (39 and 46) seems to suppose; on the point which matters most here, viz. the question at what moment the embryo becomes an animate being, Tert. differs widely from him (see comm. on § 2). For the first part of § 1 (God's care of the embryo) parallels may be adduced from contemporary writings; the second part was borrowed from Varro. The discussion occurring in § 2 is due to the wording of the text of Exod. 21, 22/3 as given by the LXX, whereas the passage referring to the symbolic of numbers (§§ 3/4) in one place at least shows the influence of Irenaeus. On the other hand, it would not be surprising if the exposition of the growth of the soul, which constitutes the second part of the chapter, must be directed against Soranus (perhaps also against Lucretius), for it is quite possible that the assertion that the growth of the soul

'affects its substance' was found in *Περὶ ψυχῆς* together with the conclusion (here strongly combated by Tert.) that from this fact the possibility of its decrease and its annihilation may be inferred. From 6, 6 we know that, according to Soranus, the soul was nourished by corporeal food, and that he regarded this fact as a proof of its mortality; now this very view is combated by Tert. in the succeeding chapter (which is closely connected with this). The refutation itself is a striking specimen of Tert.'s methods; Augustine already regarded it as such.

1. *serendi struendi fingendi*: similarly, Philo *de mut. nom.* 137: (ὁ θεός) τὸν Ἰσαὰκ διέπλασεν, ἐδημιούργησεν, ἐγέννησεν. For *struendi*, cf. 23, 1; Prud. *apoth.* 116: *verbo struxit* (sc. pater) *puerilia membra*. — *paraturam*: cf. the comm. on 2, 3 and, for this passage, *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (394, 15): *uterum, tanti animalis, id est hominis, producendi officinam*. — *aliqua . . . ministra*: it is not impossible that (as Dölger, *ACH* 4 (1934), 33₂₂, supposes) this remark derives from the very Christian Platonist that may have been used by Tert. in ch. 26 (see p. 336), as in Clem. Alex. *ecl. proph.* 50, 2 we read: εἰσιοῦσαν γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν μήτραν ἀπὸ τῆς καθάρσεως ἡϋτρεπισμένην εἰς σύλληψιν καὶ εἰσκριθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τινος τῶν τῇ γενέσει ἐφεστώτων ἀγγέλων, etc. For passages from Origenes (according to whom the activity of these angels extends to the introducing of the previously existent soul into the body), see Dölger, 30/1, for the apocalypse of St. Peter, *ib.* 50. According to Athenagoras (*legat.* 35), the embryo is the object of God's particular care. Cf. also *hist. Joseph. fabr. lagn.* 13 (p. 121 Tischendorf): *facies angeli mihi ad custodiam inde a formationis meae die designati*; *Exc. ex Theodoto* 53, 2: ἔσχεν δὲ ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἀδήλως αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῆς Σοφίας ἐνσπαρὲν τὸ σπέρμα τὸ πνευματικὸν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν, 'διαταγείς', φησι, 'δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου . . . δι' ἀγγέλων οὖν τῶν ἀρρένων τὰ σπέρματα ὑπηρετεῖται τὰ εἰς γένεσιν προβληθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς Σοφίας. — On *modulatur* La Cerda remarks: "moduli et numeri velut compositioni alicui poeticae tribuuntur divinis operibus ob mirum eorumdem ordinem et symmetriam", and compares Censorin. *de die nat.* 12, 1: *nec vero incredibile est ad nostros natales musicam pertinere*. It is not altogether out of the question that Tert. intentionally used this verb in the introduction to a chapter dealing with the symbolism of numbers; cf. also Philo *de mut. nom.* 184: ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς γεγόναμεν κράματα, θείου καὶ θνητοῦ συγκερασθέντων καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τῆς τελείας μουσικῆς λόγους ἀρμοσθέντων. This association with music is unquestionable in *bapt.* 8, 1 (after a description of the *organum hydraulicum*): *deo autem in suo organo* (sc. in homine) *non licebit per manus sanctas sublimitatem modulari spiritalem*? Since, however, in many passages in which Tert. uses *modulari* (e. g. *iei.* 4 (278, 4); *adv. Marc.* 2, 12 (351, 20/1); *praescr.* 42, 16) this association is not found, La Cerda's interpretation is not altogether indispensable. — *illam* should be retained: for the use of *quicumque*, cf. *apol.* 48, 2: *si quaecumque ratio praeest* (see also Radermacher, *NT Gramm.*², 76). For the infin. after *sortita*, see the comm. on 8, 4. — *superstitio Romana*: this combination is also found

in *adv. Marc.* 1, 9 (301, 2) and *Min. Fel.* 24, 10. — *Alemonam*: the names of the goddesses have been taken from Varro (*M. Agahd, M. Ter. Varr. Antiq. rer. div. libri I XIV XV XVI* (Neue Jahrb. N. F., Suppl. 24 (1898), 1/220), quotes this passage as *lib. 14* ('de diis certis'), frag. 10). *Alemona* is mentioned in the present passage only (see Peter in Roscher, II 1, 192). — *alendi* . . . fetus: a similar genit. is found in *ad nat.* 2, 11, 8: *exinde et primi cibi sumen<di potionisque capiendae> Potina et Edula, et statuendi infantis Sta<tina>*. Immediately after Tert. writes: <*Ab adeundo Adeona, abeun<do Abeona est* (the supplying of the lacuna by Borleffs may be regarded as perfectly plausible); cf. in this passage the words *et Nonam et Decimam a sollicitioribus*, and *loc. cit.* § 10: <*habent et Pave<ntinam pavoris, spei Niliam* . . . *aeque ab actu Peragenorem, a consiliis Consum*. Thus *alendi fetus* is to be interpreted as a possessive genit.: 'superstition created a goddess Alemona, as connected with the feeding of the embryo', which is almost equivalent to: 's. created a g. A. for the purpose of feeding the embryo'. The use of the genit. of the gerundive with final meaning (Hofm., *Synt.*, 402, Konjetzny, 346/7; Löfst., *Synt.*, I, 139/42), which seems alien to Tert., is not to be stated here. — *Nonam et Decimam*: Gell. 3, 16 (= Varro, *loc. cit.*, frag. 12a, p. 167): *Antiquos autem Romanos Varro dicit non recepisse huiusmodi quasi monstruosas raritates, sed nono mense aut decimo, neque praeter hos aliis, partionem mulieris secundum naturam fieri existimasse idcircoque eos nomina Fatibus tribus fecisse a pariendo et a nono atque decimo mense. Nam 'Parca', inquit, 'inmutata una littera a partu nominata, item Nona et Decima a partus tempestivi tempore'*. Cf. Agahd, 79₁ and 167, note; for *Nona*, see Peter in Roscher, II 1, 208, for *Decima*, *ib.* 196, for *Partula*, *ib.* 212. — *Lucinam*: Varro frag. 14b, p. 168; Peter, 172 *seqq.* and 203; K. Latte, art. 'Lucina', R. E. XIII, 1648/51. — *officia* has the concrete meaning 'servants', which is a very common one in late Latin (in *de an.* also 40, 4); cf. Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 214. Friedländer's faulty conjecture *angelis* was already refuted by H. K. Benicken (Neue Jahrb. 23 (1877), 224), who rightly referred to Hebr. 1, 14: οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν λειτουργικά πνεύματα;

2. *Ex eo . . . fetus in utero homo, a quo forma completa est*: in *apol.* 9, 8 Tert. gives a more general definition: *homo est qui est futurus*. The specification occurring in the passage under discussion is due to the wording of the quotation from Exodus (a somewhat different explanation is given by Dölger (Ach 4 (1934), 36/7), who takes no account of the influence of this text on the formulation). Tert. supposes that the embryo is an animate being, a ζῷον (cf. 25, 5), but that it may only be regarded as a human being from the moment when it attains its final form. This discrimination (which had not yet occurred to Tert. in ch. 25 and 27), is found nowhere else. Finally, the two views that the soul is present in the embryo from the moment of conception, and that only the foetus which has attained its final form may be called *homo*, are incompatible with each other: for instance, when Philo calls the embryo ἀνθρώπος when it is ἐξεικονισμένον,

he assumes that the soul is present in it from that moment; this same view is defended by the adherents of creatianism. On the other hand, Tert. cannot but assume that also the embryo which has not yet attained its final form already possesses a soul. It is, however, hardly probable that he was conscious of this consequence of his theory: the object he had in view was to combat the doctrine of metempsychosis (hence the assertion that the soul is present in the foetus from the moment of conception), and not to diverge from the data of Holy Scripture (hence the reference to the formation of the body). It is, of course, possible that he assumed a gradual growth of the faculties of the soul in the embryo, as Soranus did (see below), but in that case it is rather strange that he does not say a word about it here. So we may be justified in supposing that this statement was primarily due to the context. — **Mosei lex**: here the wording of the text of the LXX has influenced Tert. (the Hebrew text (see Dölger, *op. cit.*, 3/4) does not take into account the life of the unborn child): ἐάν δὲ μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξωσιν γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται· καθότι ἂν ἐπιβάλῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς γυναίκας, δώσει μετὰ ἀξιώματος· ἐάν δὲ ἐξεικονισμένον ᾖ, δώσει ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὁφθαλμοῦ (cf. Dölger, 6/7). This passage is also the basis for the discussion by Philo (*de spec. leg.* 3, 108/9), who, like Tert., calls the foetus which has attained its final form 'a human being' (but on the ground of a different conception, cf. above; another theory is found *ib.* 117/8: Dölger, 20/1). Origenes, when discussing this passage in *homil. in Exod.*, passes over this question without any comment; nor do Hieron. (who in the Vulgate of course follows the Hebrew text) and Aug. say anything about it. On the other hand, it is fairly often quoted as an argument in favour of creatianism, e. g. [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 23 (after quoting the present text): *ut probaret* (sc. Moyses) *non inesse animam ante formam* (completely different from Tert., who considers the soul to be present in the embryo from the moment of conception); [Ambros.] *de trin.* 18; Theodoret. *haer. fab.* 5, 9; *Graec. affect.* 5, 52: περὶ γὰρ δὴ τῆς ἐγκύμονος τῆς ἐκ τινων πληγῶν ἀμβλωσκούσης διαλεγόμενος, διαμορφοῦσθαι πρότερον ἐν τῇ νηδύϊ λέγει (sc. Moses) το βρέφος, εἴθ' οὕτω ψυχοῦσθαι, οὐ θύραθεν ποθεν τῆς ψυχῆς εἰσκρινομένης, οὐδέ γε ἐκ τῆς γονῆς φουομένης (as was the opinion of Tert.), ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ ὄρω κατὰ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐντεθέντα ἐν τῇ φύσει νόμον δεχομένης τὴν γένεσιν. — **aborsus** is equivalent here to **abortus** as in *fuga* 9, 4: *nolite in lectulis nec in aborsibus et febribus mollibus optare exire, sed in martyriis*. The word is found from Lucr. and Cic. downwards (Thes. l. I: 127, 11 seqq.) A very remarkable definition is found in Non. Marc. 448: *aborsus ille dicendus est, qui eiectus est in primis mensibus, cum conceptui exordium factum est; abortus qui prope tempus pariendi: tunc enim moritur quod nascitur*. On this passage Thes. l. L., loc. cit., l. 5/10 observes: "differentiam statutam a Nonio . . . umquam fuisse probatam scriptoribus vix credibile"; nevertheless, the author of the article refers to Muscio 2, 13, 47: *est . . . aborsus ut secundo vel tertio mense*

iam formatum sed sine anima et gracile pecus emittat (sc. matrix; cf. Soran. *gynaec.* 3, 47: ἔκτροια μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἀποπτυσμὸς τοῦ σπέρματος μετὰ τὴν συνουσίαν μετὰ πρῶτην ἢ δευτέραν <ἢ τρίτην> ἡμέραν, ἔκτρωσις δὲ ἢ μετὰ δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον μῆνα φθορὰ τοῦ ἐμβρύου). In the present passage *aborsus* denotes exactly the same thing that Nonius calls *abortus* (Tert.: *cum iam illi vita et mortis status deputatur*, Non.: *tunc enim moritur quod nascitur*). The definition by Muscio (who frequently uses *aborsus* as strictly equivalent to *abortus*, e. g. 2, 6, 31; 2, 10, 40) in 2, 13, 47 does not prove that Tert. should attach the same meaning to this word; still it is possible that by *aborsus* Tert. means a rather early stage immediately following the moment at which the embryo attains its final form (perhaps the repeated use of *iam* is in favour of this interpretation), as, according to Muscio, a *iam formatum pecus* is meant. Yet the most probable solution is that *aborsus* here is strictly equivalent to *abortus*. — *cum . . . deputatur*: cf. the passage just quoted from Non. Marc. and 25, 4: *Denique et mortui eduntur; quomodo, nisi et vivi? Qui autem et mortui, nisi qui prius vivi?* — *cum et fato iam inscribitur*: the interpretation of *fato* is not quite certain; the most probable translation seems to be: “when it is already recorded in <the book of> fate”. By this *liber fati* we may understand the ‘book of the living’ frequently mentioned in Judaic literature and in the N T (e. g. Apoc. 3, 3; 13, 8; 17, 8; 20, 12, 15; 21, 27; Luc. 10, 20; Philipp. 4, 3; in the O T: Exod. 32, 32; Ps. 68, 29; Iesai. 4, 3; Dan. 7, 10; 12, 1; cf. Henoch 104, 1; Od. Salom. 9, 11/2; Strack-Billerbeck, 2, 169/76; Klostermann’s note on Luc. 10, 20; R. H. Charles *ad* Apoc. 3, 5; Lohmeyer *ad* Apoc. 3, 5 and 20, 11). It should, however, not be forgotten that in this book not all men are registered, but only the faithful (from Tert.’s works cf. *cor.* 13, 9: *illius* (sc. Christi) *es, conscriptus in libris vitae; ad ux.* 1, 4; *scorp.* 12 = 173, 19); hence it might be better to call to mind the pagan conception of the book of Δίκη or the *Fata* (cf. Ruhl, *De mort. iudicio*, 101/5), a Christian version of which is found in *spect.* 27 (26, 12/5): *dubitas illo enim momento, quo diabolus in ecclesiam furit, omnes angelos prospicere de caelo et singulos denotare, quis blasphemiam dixerit . . .?*; cf. also *hist. Josephi fabri lign.* 26 (p. 130 Tischendorf); *Ascens. Isai.* 9, 22. Finally, it is not altogether out of the question (cf. 39, 2: *Fata Scribunda*) that the sense is: “when it is already recorded by the *fatum*”. — *etsi . . . sortem* refers to 25, 3.

3. *de . . . nascentis*: cf. Chalcid. *comm.* 38 Müll.: *sufficiat ergo demonstrasse rationem nascentis animae*. — *decimi mensis*: for this calculation, see J. Carcopino, *Virgile et le mystère de la IVe Églogue* (Paris 1930), 94 *seqq.* — *decurialis* as an adj. occurs in the present passage only (Thes. I. L. V, 1: 224, 12/5). — *parentem*: the well-known Pythagorean doctrine, cf. e. g. Aët. 1, 3, 8: εἶναι δὲ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ δεκάδα· μέχρι γὰρ τῶν δέκα πάντες Ἕλληνες, πάντες βάρβαροι ἀριθμοῦσιν, ἐφ’ ἃ ἐλθόντες πάλιν ἀναποδοῦσιν ἐπὶ τὴν μονάδα; Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 2, 8/9 (D D G 556, 16/24); *ib.* 4, 51, 7; Philo *opif. mundi* 47: (δεκάς) ἥτις ὅρος τῆς ἀπειρίας τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐστὶ, περὶ ὃν ὡς

καμπτήρα ειλούνται καὶ ἀνακάμπτουσι; K. Staehle, *Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria* (Leipsic-Berlin 1931), 53/8; F. E. Robbins, *Class. Philol.* 26 (1931), 349/50; L. Cohn, *Breslauer philol. Abh.* IV 17, 72; for *Athenag. legat.* 6, cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 174. To my knowledge, this association of the δεκάς with the ten months of pregnancy is found nowhere else; cf. however, *Corp. Herm., Exc.* XV, 4 Scott: τὸ δ' ἐν τῇ νηδύι ἀριθμοῖς λοχεύει καὶ μαιοῦται ἡ φύσις, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἕξω ἀέρα ἀγει (Scott's note seems to be completely wrong), and *ib. lib.* 13, 12: ἡ γὰρ δεκάς . . . ἐστὶ ψυχρόνομος.

4. *ad deum argumentabor*: "I shall explain with regard to God", or "I shall refer to God"; cf. *spect.* 8 (9, 15/6): *ab ea* (sc. *Circe*) *et circi appellationem argumentantur*: "they explain the word *circus* as derived from *Circe*". — *inaugurent*: with a dat. this verb also occurs in *res.* 47 (96, 29). — *ut tanto . . . renascimur*: similarly, Cassiodor. *de anima* 16: *ut cursus vitae atque operatio sacramenta caelestis decalogi contineret*. — *septimo . . . octavo*: Alex. Aphrodis. *problem.* 2, 47 (1, 65 Ideler): διὰ τί τὰ ἑπταμηνιαῖα βρέφη ζώσιμα, τὰ δ' ὀκτωμηνιαῖα οὐκέτι; ὅτι ὁ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸς τέλειός ἐστι τῇ φύσει, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Πυθαγόρας καὶ οἱ ἀριθμητικοὶ καὶ οἱ μουσικοί, ὁ δ' ὀκτὼ ἀτέλης; *Theol. arithm.* (63, 1 *seqq.* de Falco); Aët. 5, 18, 6 ([Galen] *hist. philos.* 122 = *D D G* 644, 17 *seqq.*). Cf. also Censorin. *de die nat.* 7,2: *Hippon Metapontinus a septimo ad decimum mensem nasci posse aestimavit. nam septimo partum iam esse maturum eo quod in omnibus numerus septenarius plurimum possit, siquidem septem formemur mensibus*. It was a much discussed question whether children born in the eighth month of pregnancy could live; this was denied by [Hippocr.] Π. ἑπταμήνου 4 (VII 442 Littré), Π. ὀκταμήνου (*ib.* 452), Π. σαρκῶν 19 (VIII 612), and Π. προφῆς 42 (IX 114; cf. the commentary by Galen, XV 407 *seq.* Kühn). The opposite view was taken by Diocles (Wellmann, *Frag. d. gr. Ärzte*, I, 174), Aristotle (*hist. anim.* 7, 4 = 584a 36; the fragment preserved by Oribasius 3, 63 (Rose, *Arist. pseudepigr.*, frag. 382) contains a restriction), Polybus, and the empirical school (Aët. 5, 18, 3). In [Galen] *hist. philos.* 122 (*D D G* 644, 23/4) Epicurus is mentioned together with Diocles as adherent to this view; for Euryphon of Cnidus, cf. Wellmann, *op. cit.*, 38, for Varro, *Gell.* 3, 16, 6 and *D D G* 195. Pliny (*n. h.* 7, 39) follows Aristotle; for the opinion of Soranus, cf. Muscio 1, 77: *difficile est aliquos evadere qui octavo mense nascuntur*; Vindician. 12; [Soran.] *ad Soteris obsetrix* (138, 11/2 Rose). Cf. also Caecil. *Plocium* 4 Ribb.: *soletne mulier decimo mense parere?* — *Pol nono quoque, etiam septimo atque octavo*; *Pass. Perpet.* 15, 5: *et cum pro naturali difficultate octavi mensis in partu laborans doleret*. For the ἑπταμηνιαῖα (whose vitality was only denied by Euryphon of Cnidus: Censorin. 7, 5), cf. Aët. 5, 18; Theo Smyrn. p. 104, 4/5 Hiller; Philo *opif. mundi* 41 and 124; *leg. allegor.* 1, 9; *Theol. arithm.* 42 (55, 6 de Falco); Favon. *Eulog. de somn. Scip.* p. 9, 26/7 Holder; Alex. Aphrodis. *comm. in Arist. metaphys.* p. 38, 19 Hayduck; Asclepius *comm. in Arist. metaphys.* p. 34, 24 and 65, 5 Hayduck; Joh. Lyd. *de mens.* 2, 12 (p. 35, 11/3 Wunsch); Martian. *Cap.* 7, 739. — *dedicata*, i. e.

inaugurata (cf. the note on 19, 7). — in auspicia . . . regni: in *Pisciculi* . . . Fr. J. Dölger . . . dargeboten (Münster i. W. 1939), 276/8, I have associated this passage with Iren. 5, 30, 4 (*cum autem vastaverit Antichristus hic omnia in hoc mundo, regnabit annis tribus et mensibus sex, et sedebit in templo Hierosolymis; tunc veniet Dominus de caelis in nubibus, in gloria Patris, illum quidem et oboedientes ei in stagnum ignis mittens; adducens autem iustis regni tempora, hoc est requietionem, septimam diem sanctificatam*; cf. *ib.* 5, 32, 1. 34, 3. 35, 1. 36, 1), and interpreted the *regnum* as the millennium, and the *resurrectio* as the *resurrectio sanctorum*, the *prima resurrectio*, which Tert. discusses in *res.* 25 (61, 10), and to which he alludes in *an.* 35, 3 and 58, 8 (cf. also F. Cumont in: Dölger, *ACh* 5 (1936), 293/4). Usually the *hebdomas* is interpreted as the *tempus huius saeculi* in contradistinction to the *ogdoas*, the symbol of eternity, i.e. of the time subsequent to the Last Judgment (cf. for this interpretation F. J. Dölger, *Zur Symbolik des altchristlichen Taufhauses. Das Oktagon und die Symbolik der Achtzahl*, *ACh* 4 (1934), 153/87; add Clem. Alex. *strom.* 6, 108, 1 and *Firm. Mat. err. prof. relig.* 25, 3). Occasionally a different interpretation of the *hebdomas* is found, viz. as *sabbatum* = *futura requies*, or as the immediate introduction to the *ogdoas*, e.g. Aug. *confess.* 13, 36, 52: *dies autem septimus sine vespera est, nec habet occasum, quia sanctificasti eum ad permansionem sempiternam, ut . . . et nos post opera nostra . . . bona valde, quia tu nobis ea donasti, sabbato vitae aeternae requiescamus in te*; *serm.* 4, 7, 8; 9, 5, 6; *civ. dei* 22, 30, 5: *haec tamen septima erit sabbatum nostrum, cuius finis non erit vespera, sed Dominicus dies velut octavus aeternus, qui Christi resurrectione sacratus est, aeternam non solum spiritus, verum etiam corporis requiem praefigurans* (the other interpretation is given in *comm. in Ps.* 147, 5: *post omnem istam volubilitatem temporis, quae septenario numero volvitur*); cf. also *serm.* 259, 2; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.* ,app. 51 (p. 429 Souter): *futuri enim sabbati, quod in aeternis dabit requiem, figura est hoc sabbatum*; Hippolyt. in *Dan.* 4, 23 (where this interpretation is associated with chiliasm): τὸ σάββατον τύπος ἐστὶν καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας τῶν ἁγίων, ἥνικα συμβασιλεύσουσιν τῷ Χριστῷ; Beda *hexam.* 1 (P. L. 91, 38C); perhaps the present passage was imitated in [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 18 (197, 4/5 Batiffol-Wilmart): *et septimo die Domini regnum sanctorum erit*. See also A R W 23 (1925), 96 and Reitzenstein, *Z N T W* 15 (1914), 67/8. — *ogdoas nos non creat*: an association of the ὀκτάμηνοι with the *ogdoas* is also found in Ambros. *ep.* 44, 5 (Dölger, *op. cit.*, 163). For the symbolic interpretation of the *ogdoas* as *aeternitas post iudicium domini*, cf. the passages collected by Dölger, and for the symbolism of the *ogdoas* in general, Cumont, *Mag. Hellén.*, 1, 173, and 219, and *Relig. Orient.*, 283. Add Hippolyt., Arab. frag. from the *comm.* on the Pentateuch, frag. 16 (p. 104 Achelis): “on the eighth day, which is the day of the Last Judgment”; [Hippolyt.] *Introd. to the Ps.*, frag. 9 (p. 139 Ach.); Gregor. Nyss., *In verba ‘Faciamus hominem’ orat.* 2 (P. G. 44, 288C); Filast. 141, 4/5; Method. *sympos.* 7, 6: ἡ τῆς πνευματικῆς ὀγδοάδος ἀρχὴ καὶ γνῶσις; Victorin. *Pectav. de fabr. mundi* 6 (5, 23/5 Haussleiter); Beda *hexam.*

1 and *de temp. rat.* 71; Verecundus Iunc. *expos. Ezech.* 2; Orig. in *Matth. caten.* frag. 432 (GCS Orig. XII 1, 180, on Matth. 22, 3): οὗτος ὁ αἰὼν κλησίς, οὗτος παρασκευή· ἐκεῖνος σάββατον καὶ ὀγδοάς. For the interpretation of the ὀγδοάς in the Gnostic systems, cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobl.*, 340₂ (343; 354/5) and Wendland, *Kultur*, 176, for the *Corpus Hermeticum*, W. Kroll, R. E. VIII, 812 and J. Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 304/6 and 412; cf. also Dieterich, *Abrazas*, 194 and Lohmeyer's note on Apoc. 17, 10. — *tune . . . erunt*: cf. *exh. cast.* 13, 39/41 and the lengthy discussion in *res.* 60/1; Orig. *comm. in evang. Ioh.* 2, 33, 198: διὸ οὐ δύναται γεγενῆσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς 'ἐβδομάδος τοῦ θεοῦ' ἡμῶν, τὴν μετὰ τὸ σάββατον ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐμποιοῦντος τοῖς συμμέροφιν τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ γεγενημένοις καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.

5. The subsequent discussion of the growth of the soul is dominated by the idea *animam substantia crescere negandum est, ne etiam decrescere substantia dicatur atque ita et defectura credatur*. The quantitative growth of the soul was used by Lucr. 3, 445/58 as an argument in favour of its transitoriness; it is not impossible that Tert. has this passage in mind here. Heinze *ad loc.* refers to Hdt. 3, 134: αὐξανόμενῳ γὰρ τῷ σώματι συναύξονται καὶ αἱ φρένες, etc.; [Hippocr.] Π. διαίτης 1, 25 (VI 496 Littré); Galen in *Plat. Tim. ap. Eustath. ad Odyss.* 2, 315; Epic. Π. θεῶν (Scott, *frag. Hercul.*, p. 249); Philodem. *de morte*, col. 9; Aug. *de quantit. anim.* 26 (where the growth of the soul is quoted in proof of its mortality). It is, however, only in the last-mentioned passage that this growth is clearly qualified as a quantitative one; cf. *ib.* 28, where Augustine replies: *non igitur tibi debet videri animus sicut corpus crescendo cum aetate proficere: proficiendo enim ad virtutem pervenit, quam fateamur nulla spatii magnitudine, sed magna vi constantiae pulchram esse atque perfectam*. Cf. also *schol. in Hom. Il.* 1, 115 (St. V. F. 3, Antipater Tarsensis, frag. 50): ἀπαλόν τέ σφ' ἦτορ ἀπηύρα] οὕτως Ἀριστέλης καὶ Ἀντίπατρος ὁ ἱατρὸς συναύξεσθαι φασὶ τῷ σώματι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ συμμειοῦσθαι πάλιν and Plotin. 4, 7, 5. This material conception was adopted by Vincentius Victor; cf. the refutation by Aug. *de anim. et ei. orig.* 4, 18, 28, which begins with the words: *iam illud quale est, dicere quod anima formam de corpore accipiat, et cum incremento corporis protendatur et crescat*. A detailed discussion is found in Orig. *de princ.* 1, 1, 6 (23, 4/10 Koetschau): *Indiget sane mens magnitudine intelligibili, quia non corporaliter, sed intellegibiliter crescit. Non enim corporalibus incrementis simul cum corpore mens usque ad vicesimum vel tricesimum annum aetatis augetur, sed eruditionibus atque exercitiis adhibitis acumen quidem eliminatur ingenii, quaeque sunt ei insita ad intelligentiam provocantur* (Tert. § 7: *crementa . . . provocativa*), *et capax maioris efficitur intellectus non corporalibus incrementis aucta, sed eruditionis exercitiis eliminata*. Undoubtedly Augustine had this chapter in mind when writing in *de gen. ad litt.* 10, 21, 37: *quia utique simplicem animae substantiam incrementis augeri corporalibus, nec illi putaverunt qui eam corpus existimant, quorum in parte*

sunt maxime qui eam ex parentibus creari opinantur. Ib. 26, 44⁵ he explicitly mentions and refutes the present passage: *Noluit tamen Tertullianus animam crescere substantia sicut corpus, afferens etiam timoris sui causam. 'Ne etiam decrescere substantia dicatur', inquit, 'atque ita et defectura credatur'. Et tamen quia per corpus eam localiter tendit, non invenit exitum incrementorum eius, quam vult de semine exiguo aequari corporis quantitati, et ait 'sed vis eius . . . sed provocativa'.* (45) *Quis hunc crederet cum isto corde tam disertum esse potuisse? Sed tremenda ista sunt, non ridenda. Ad hoc enim numquid cogeretur, si aliquid cogitare posset, quod et sit, et corpus non sit? Quid autem absurdius quam putare massam cuiuspiam metalli ex aliqua parte crescere posse, dum tunditur, nisi decrescat ex altera; vel augeri latitudine, nisi crassitudine minuat? aut ullum esse corpus manente naturae suae quantitate, quod undique crescat, nisi rarecat? Quomodo igitur implebit anima ex illa stilla seminis magnitudinem corporis, quod animat, si et ipsa corpus est, cuius substantia nullo accessu crescat? Quomodo, inquam, implebit carnem, quam vivificat, nisi tanto rarius fuerit, quanto grandius quod animaverit? Timuit videlicet, ne deficeret etiam minuendo, si cresceret, et non timuit ne deficeret rarescendo, cum cresceret.* After these words, which contain a complete refutation, it is hardly necessary to point out the weak points in Tert.'s exposition. As he wants before everything to refute the assertion that the growth of the soul may be regarded as an argument for its mortality, he has completely forgotten his own explanation in 9, 7/8, which simply compels him to assume a *crescere substantia*. For the theory of Gregor. Nyss. on this subject and its Platonic sources, see Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 197/9; cf. also Lactant. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 10: *mens ergo id est intellegentia vel augetur vel minuitur pro aetate. anima in statu suo semper est. — iamdudum: viz. in ch. 27. — figmenti: 'that which is created', as opposed to the preceding seminum. It is possible (but not at all certain) that Tert. was influenced here by the terminology of Soranus, who defines conception (gynaec. 1, 43, 1/3) as κράτησις ἐπίμονος σπέρματος ἢ ἐμβρύου ἢ ἐμβρύων, and draws the dividing-line at the moment when the embryo attains its final form (ib. § 3): ὅτι κατὰ μὲν τοὺς πρώτους χρόνους, ὅτε ἀκμὴν ἀδιατύπωτός ἐστιν ὁ γόνος, ἡ σύλληψις σπέρματος ὑπάρχει, μετὰ δὲ τοὺς πρώτους χρόνους, τετυπωμένου τοῦ κατὰ γαστρός καὶ μηκέτι ὄντος τοῦ σπέρματος, οὐ παύεται μὲν οὖσα σύλληψις, ἐστὶν δὲ οὐ σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐμβρύου. By the *figmenti perfectio* the moulding of the embryo may be meant, in which case the words refer to § 2: *a quo forma completa est*; however, it is also possible that Tert. means birth. *Figmentum* with this meaning (also *res*. 5 = 32, 20; 6 = 33, 6; 40 = 83, 6) is found in Christian literature only (Thes. 1. L. VI: 709, 31/50). — *divisa* (A; *diversa* B Gel) may be retained; cf. the comm. on 27, 8. *divise* = *diverse* is found in c. Chr. 13, 27. — *habitu*: 'as to the external form', cf. e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 12, 8: *argilla . . . habitum, quem placuit argillae, intus cruci ingerit.* — *peculia* is equivalent here to *proprietates*; cf. Beck, 96 (where the faulty quotations *adv. Val.* 24 and *pud.* 22 should be excised).*

6. **Constitue**: *c. exemplum* (from Sen. *de clem.* 1, 7, 1 downwards) occurs in *iei.* 9 (285, 12). — **collectus** here means *solidus* (Thes. I. L. III: 1621, 27/35) or *brevis* (cf. *minor*; see Thes., *loc. cit.*, 36/45; Rönisch, *N. T. T.*, 380 and 673/4; *Sem.*, 2, 6). The latter sense is also found in numerous quotations of 1 Cor. 7, 29 (ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν), e. g. in *ad ux.* 1, 5: *tempus . . . in collecto est.* — **cum . . . laxatur**: a complete parallel is furnished by Stat. *Achill.* 1, 429/30: *ferrum laxatur in usus / innumeros* (cod. Gudianus; *lassatur* P Q); cf. also Avit. *carm.* 1, 77: *flectere laxatas per cuncta sequacia ceras* (hence in Ennod. *carm.* 2, 46, 2: *candida lassatum vix tangit membra metallum* Hartel's conjecture *laxatum* is highly plausible). We may refer to the similar use of *solvere* (Ennod. *carm.* 2, 132, 2: *solvitur atque chalybs more fluentis aquae*; Coripp. *Joh.* 5, 502), *mollire* (Paulin. Petrocor. *Vit. Mart.* 3, 94: *mollitum in fila metallum*; Sidon. Apollin. *carm.* 22, 199), and *lentare* (Orient. *commonit.* 1, 555: *lentato per lubrica fila metallo*). — **initio suo**: 'than its original form'; cf. 19, 5: *ex primordio . . . fruticis.* — **non, dum augetur** is the correct punctuation; cf. *res.* 54 (113, 3/5): *dum indutum immortalitate absconditur . . . non, dum absumitur et amittitur.* — **habitu**: this word, which is also found at the beginning of this exposition, was of course intended to conceal the weak points of the argument; but already Augustine showed how little successful Tert. has been.

7. **facilitate materiae**: cf. *pall.* 3, 5 with the note by Gerlo. — **duxerit**: this verb is frequently used to denote metal-working; cf. Thes. I. L. V, 1: 2148, 65 *seqq.* — **aget** is to be retained as the *lectio difficilior*, cf. the note on 10, 6: *erunt haec in omnibus utique quae vivunt*; similarly, the future *aget* is due to the preceding *duxerit*. — **substantiva** (cf. 20, 1) . . . **provocativa** (Tp): an equally curious antithesis is found in *res.* 40 (83, 16/7): *fidem quidem et dilectionem non substantiva animae ponens, sed conceptiva* ('as qualities which are assumed').

38. *The puberty of the soul* (with an additional note on the significance of corporeal nourishment to the soul).

"Body and soul attain puberty simultaneously, as is proved, not by the verdict of an authority such as Asclepiades or by the Civil Code, but by the *forma primordii*, the situation described in Genesis (§ 1). For if, as soon as they were able to discriminate between good and evil, Adam and Eve felt that they should cover their privy parts, then we too, from the moment that we feel the same impulse, acknowledge this discrimination <, and along with it the simultaneity of the puberty of body and soul is proved>. When we reach this age, we, too, leave a paradise, i. e. the paradise of innocence, and are troubled by new desires, which are no longer in accordance with nature, but sinful (§ 2). <By desires I mean unnatural desires:> for there is only one natural desire, i. e. the desire of food, which God has approved of in Holy Scripture, and which was meant rather for the flesh than for the soul, although with a view to the soul as

well. For the soul in itself needs no corporeal nourishment: if it did, we should be obliged to agree with Soranus in considering it to be mortal (§ 3). But first of all we ought to answer the question why and how far this nourishment is needed. Now the soul desires corporeal food for itself, because it needs it <on account of external circumstances>, but it desires it for the body, because the latter needs it in itself (§ 4): <I intentionally add: 'it desires it for the body',> for it is essential to the soul that its dwelling-place should remain intact <, but only as far as its stay in the body is concerned> (§ 5): for if this dwelling-place were to decay, the soul can leave it without experiencing any harm to itself (§ 6)".

It may be assumed that in *Περὶ ψυχῆς* Soranus discussed puberty seeing that Asclepiades is mentioned in this context (see Introduction, p. 23*) and that by Aëtius a whole chapter (5, 23) is devoted to this subject (*Πότε ἀρχεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς τελειότητος*; see the note on *agnitionem* in § 2). So it may be supposed that the nucleus of § 1 was taken from *Περὶ ψυχῆς* (to which nucleus Tert. added the note about the *iura civilia* drawn from his juridical knowledge), whereas in § 2 the argument is based on Holy Scripture. On the other hand, it is less plausible, as Karpp (p. 46) seems to suppose, that the long discussion on the importance of corporeal food for the soul should be due to a remark made by Soranus in this context, for Soranus certainly voiced his ideas upon this subject in a much earlier passage of his work (see comm. on 6, 6). So it may be assumed that this additional discussion is the natural consequence of the discrimination between natural and unnatural desires made in §§ 2/3, whence it follows that the construction of the whole chapter should be regarded as a much more independent piece of work than Karpp supposes. For the classification of desires, which we need by no means regard as taken from Soranus' work, see the comm. on § 3.

In one passage (§ 2: *ad instar ficulneae contagionis*) we may have to take into account the influence of Irenaeus (see comm.).

1. **Quamquam** is followed by the subjunctive as is usual in Tert.'s works (cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 78); the indic. is mostly found in cases when *quamquam* has a 'corrective' sense ('to be sure'), e. g. 50, 3; *bapt.* 14, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 9, 11; 1, 10, 33; 1, 12, 2; 1, 15, 8; 1, 19, 2. The same holds good for Cypr. (Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 108/9). Hofmann's assertion (*Synt.*, 737): "Im Spätlatein wird der Konj. ganz allgemein und wahllos neben dem Indik. gebraucht . . . insbesondere von Eocl. wie Min. Fel., Tert. . . ." should be corrected to this effect. — **retro**: 'before' (cf. 23, 6) refers to 20, 1: *omnia . . . censetur*. — **prae-struxerimus**: cf. 18, 5. — **procedere**: from 20, 2: *processus . . . varii*; for *evadere*, see *ib.*; *pro artibus . . . potestatibus*: 20, 3/5. — **quod faciat ad** = *quod pertineat ad* as in *ad nat.* 2, 3, 2: *quod ad praesentem speciem facit*. The sense 'to contribute to' (which is found since Ovid: *Thes.* l. L. VI: 122, 42 *seqq.*) is much more common (e. g. 57, 3; *spect.* 5 (7, 15); *apol.* 29, 3: *facit ad causam* (Waltzing: 'cela est encore en faveur de ma thèse'); *ib.* 5, 1. 23, 8; *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (560, 5); *mart.* 1; *idol.*

1 (30, 8); *res.* 6 (33, 21) and *adv. Herm.* 36 (166, 12): 'what is the use of it?'. For the subjunct., cf. *fuga* 12, 1: *quod . . . pertineat ad*, and Baehrens, *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 401/2. — *suggestu*: cf. the note on 1, 1. — *Aselepiades*: ultimately this notice reaches back to the *Vetusta Placita* (cf. *Intro.*, p. 30*). For the δεύτερα ἑβδομας as the beginning of puberty, cf. *St. V. F.* 1, frag. 149; *Diog. Laërt.* 7, 55 (Stoa); Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrb., Suppl.* 24, 566. 623 (Posidonius); Solon frag. 27, 3/4; *Arist. hist. anim.* 5, 14 (544b 27); *Philo de opif. mundi* 104; *Clem. Alex. strom.* 6, 144, 3 *seqq.*; *Theo Smyrn.* p. 104, 8 Hiller; *Macrob. in somn. Scip.* 1, 6, 71; *Censorin. de die nat.* 14, 7; [Justin] *quaest. ad orthod.* 69; *Aug. de gen. ad litt.* 10, 13, 23; for Soranus, cf. *gynaec.* 1, 4, 20; *Muscio* p. 131, 14 Rose: *Soranus respondit: ab annis nubendis legitimis quattuordecim* — *iura civilia*: similarly, *v. v.* 11: *nam feminas quidem a duodecim annis, masculum vero a duobus amplius ad negotia mittunt*; cf. *dig.* 28, 1, 5: *Ulpianus libro sexto ad Sabinum. A qua aetate testamentum vel masculi vel feminae facere possunt, videamus. Verius est in masculis quidem quartum decimum annum spectandum, in feminis vero duodecimum completum*; *Macrob. Sat.* 7, 7, 6; *Festus* p. 251 M; *Sohm-Mitteis-Wenger, Instit. des röm. Rechts*¹⁷, 238. — *quoniam* is the correct reading (also in *spect.* 20 (21, 20) written as *qm̄* in A: cf. *Thörn., St. Tert.*, 3, 24₁) — *a primordio* (A) must be retained; it is found five times in *de an.*, *de primordio* (B Gel) never. For the idea, cf. the note on 9,7.

2. *agnitione*: cf. *Gen.* 2, 17: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν, but also *Aët.* 5, 23, 1: περὶ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἑβδομάδα ἐννοεῖται γίνεται καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. — *tegere senserunt*: cf. *v. v.* 11: *nihil primum senserunt* (sc. Adam et Eva) *quam erubescendum*. The *verbum sentiendi* is followed by an infin. on the analogy of the *verba voluntatis*. Cf. *Cic. orator* 195: *ego autem sentio omnes in oratione esse quasi permixtos et confusos pedes* (Kroll: 'ich bin dafür, dass' = *sententiam dico*, ψηφίζομαι; of the other examples which he adduces cf. particularly *Verg. Aen.* 10, 623: *si . . . meque hoc ita ponere sentis*). This use becomes more common from *Vitruv.* (2, 1, 8 *putavi . . . exponere*; 5, *praef.* 5: *iudicavi scribere*) and *Colum.* (5, 8, 3 *praecipere censuimus*; *Hofm., Synt.*, 581) downwards, especially after *censere* (*Thes. l. L.* III: 795, 72/82; we may add *Hegesipp.* 2, 1, 4; *Ambrst. in Rom.* 3, 26; *Apul. met.* 11, 19 (281, 7 H.); 11, 21 (282, 25/6); *Commod. instr.* 1, 3, 13; [*Cypr.*] *ep.* 2 (272, 16 H.); cf. *Sjögren, Tull.*, 156; *Hartel, A. L. L.* 3, 46; Kroll's note on *Cic. orator* 115; v. Geisau, 272). Cf. the discussion of this question by Löfstedt, *Beitr.*, 59 *seqq.* and *Eran.* 7 (1907), 57/8 (*Dictys Cretens.* 38, 13: *cuncta extrema ratus experiri*). Since the material is widely scattered, I will give here the more important data: *putare*: *Svenn., Pallad.*, 439. 535; *Löfst., loc. cit.*; *Pomocell*, 10/3; *Wistrand*, 150; *Tidn., Did.*, 142₂; also *Commod. carm. apol.* 769: *qui putant utrisque placere*; *It. (Bob.) Matth.* 3, 9: *et non putaveritis intra vos dicere . . .*; *Coripp. Joh.* 4, 377/8: *pacem qui quaerere nostram . . . putat*; *Hieron. exc. de Ps., prol. (Anecd. Mareds.* III, 1: 1, 9). — *iudicare*: *It. (Iren. lat.* 3, 12, 17) *Amos*

9, 12: *iudico non molestari eos*; Rufin.-[Clem.] *recogn.* 1, 25; 7, 27; Aug. *de vera relig.* 78; Hieron. *tract. de Ps.* 67 (*Anecd. Mareds.* III, 2: 37, 12); Wistrand, 151. — *deputare*: Greg. Magn. *ep.* 9, 165: *Romanus . . . aedificari monasterium deputavit* (cf. Norberg, 1, 130) — *docere*: Filastr. 36, 2 ∞ 4; Iren. lat. 4, 31, 1: *docuit offerri*; *Didasc. apost.*, 44 H. — *credere*: Vict. Vit. 1, 30 (this passage only is quoted in Thes. l. L. IV: 1150, 13/4); Paulin. Nol. *carm.* 31, 74; Iren. lat. 3, 12, 17; Tidner, *loc. cit.* — *ducere*: Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 145 (588 B): (Ioseph) *qui conceptum sponsae duxit non discutere*; *cod. Justin.* 6, 20, 19 *pr.*: *dubitationem amputare duximus*. — *agnoscere*: Thes. l. L. I: 1358, 43/7; Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Levit.* 2, 5: *cum agnoverit immolare*. — *intelligere*: [Sulp. Sev.] *ep.* 1, 4 (221, 20/1 Halm): *ut isti intellegent non secundum carnem, sed secundum spiritum iudicare*; Cypr. *ep.* 30, 6. — *aestimare*: Thes. l. L. I: 1107, 20 *seqq.*; Werner, 141; Kalén, 124/6 — *existimare*: *Didasc. apost.* 20, 1/2 Hauler (Tidner, *Did.*, 142). — *videtur*: Kalén 125. — *arbitrari*: Kalén, *ib.* — *aestimare*: Thes. l. L. I: 1107, 20 *seqq.*; Aug. *confess.* 9, 36. Cf. also K. Dienelt, *Glotta* 29 (1941), 123 *seqq.* — *et suffusior et vestitior sexus est*: *suffusus* 'ashamed' ('schämhaft' Hoppe, *Synt.*, 139); *suffundere* in Tert.'s works often has the meaning 'to cause to blush' (Hoppe, *loc. cit.*; *pall.* 6, 1; Goelz., *Jér.*, 258). To explain this use we must start from passages like Ovid *amor.* 3, 3, 5: *suffusa rubore*; Plin. *paneg.* 48, 4: *impudentia multo rubore suffusa*; next we find *suffundere* (-i) without *rubore* (*sanguine*), cf. Hoppe, *ib.*; *exh. cast.* 10, 22: *qua* (sc. *conscientia*) *erubescere et ipse suffunditur*, and the active *suffundere*; for *suffusio* 'blush', cf. Rönsch, *It.*, 325 and *Sem.*, 1, 68/9. In the present passage, where *sexus* has the concrete sense of *genitalia* (so e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 22, 20: *radicem eius alterutrius sexus similitudinem referre*), as is shown by *vestitior*, we must either translated 'regarded with more shame' or — which is perhaps more probable — assume a kind of personification of *sexus*, which assumption may find support in the similar use of *concupiscentia*. For *vestitior*, cf. *v. v.* 11: *et pudor ubique vestitur* (concrete use of *pudor* also in *spect.* 21 = 22, 5) and the note on the latter part of this sentence (*accingit*). The comparat. *suffusior* is only found in this place (Neue-Wagener, II³, 240). — *arbitris*: 'as intermediaries' (Thes. l. L. II: 406, 70/80), almost 'as procurers', cf. *orat.* 20 (192, 21/2): *crinium lenonem operositatem*. For passages from apologetics about 'sins of thought and eyes', cf. Lortz, 1, 110₁₀₆, and particularly 2 Petr. 2, 14: *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος* (s. Wendland, *Urchr. Lit.-Formen*, 368₃). From the Stoic 'diatribe' Wendland (*Kult.*, 95₂) adduces Epictet. 2, 18, 15; Marc. Aurel 3, 2; Sen. *dial.* 2, 7, 4. Cf. also Tert. *ad nat.* 1, 4, 15: *pudicitiam quam nec oculis contaminamus*; Sen. *controv.* 1, 2, 13: *captiva contractata oculis omnium*, where *oculis* is defended by W. Heraeus, *A. L. L.* 9, 596/7, in opposition to Kiessling's conjecture *osculis*, by a reference to Ovid *met.* 6, 478: *spectat eam Tereus praecontractatque videndo* and Aurel. Vict. *Caes.* 5, 7: *genitalia vultu contractabat*; cf. also Weyman, *Wien. Stud.*, 20 (1898), 159. — *intellegit quae sint* is rightly explained by Rigaltius: 'Iam uterque sexus intellegit quae illa sunt agere et

pati nata. Desunt utriusque sexus vocabula'. Exactly the same ellipsis is found in *orat.* 22 (195, 11 *seq.*): *nam et Eva et Adam ubi eis contigit sapere, texerunt statim quod agnoverant*; cf. also the ampler discussion in *v. v.* 11: *ex quo se intelligere coeperit* (sc. virgo) *et sensum naturae suae intrare et de virginis exire et pati novum illud quod alterius aetatis est. Nam et principes generis Adam et Eva, quamdiu intellectu carebant, nudi agebant. At ubi de arbore agnitionis gustaverunt, nihil primum senserunt quam erubescendum. Ita sui quique sexus intellectum tegmine notaverunt* (cf. also *pall.* 3, 4). A short relative clause is sometimes found as an euphemism in sexual matters, e. g. *Pl. Bacch.* 897: *neque osculatur neque illud quod dici solet*; *Catull.* 61, 203/4: *quoniam palam quod cupis cupis*, and especially *ib.* 63, 46: *Vidit* (Attis), *sine queis ubique foret*; cf. *O. Hey, A. L. L.* 11, 529; *Hofm., Synt.*, 842. 844 and *Umgangsspr.*, 145 (for a similar use of *aliquid*, cf. *Thes. l. L. I.* 1615, 59/63). For this passage, cf. *Caesar. Arelat. serm.* 177, 1 *Morin*: *quia senserunt pudendum, curaverunt tegendum . . . Quod texerunt, ibi senserunt*. — *finis* is an euphemism for *genitalia*, to which we may compare *Apul. met.* 2, 16: *inguinum fine lacinia remota* (cf. for this e. g. *Eur. Cycl.* 328; *Catull.* 32, 11; 67, 22; a different use of *finis* is found in *Cael. Aurelian. morb. chron.* 4, 6, 87: *iuxta sessionis finem, quam Graeci ἔδραν appellant*), and the use of *confinium* in *Anthol. Lat.* 253, 123/4: *non omnis resupina iacet* (sc. Venus), *sed corpore flexo / molliter et laterum qua se confinia iungunt* and 382, 1/2: *penem / confiniis laterum retortum*. — *ad instar ficulneae contagionis*: 'in analogy of the contagion caused by the fig-leaves'. This obscure passage was explained by H. Koch in his article 'Die Feigenblätter der Stammelterne bei Irenäus und bei Tertullian und die Nachwirkung ihrer Erklärungen' (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 105 (1933), 39/50). We must start from *pud.* 6 (229, 26/8): *adhuc* (sc. ante Christi adventum) *in Adam deputabatur* (sc. caro) *cum suo vitio, facile quod speciosum viderat concupiscens et ad inferiora respiciens et de ficulneis foliis pruriginem retinens*, for (Koch, 40) "gerade von den Feigenblättern haftete Adam und seinen Nachkommen der schmutzige Milchsafte der Geilheit, das Gift der Wollust an, bis das Fleisch Christi . . . Rettung brachte". We must also pay attention to the sequel (text as given by Koch): *Inhaerebat usquequaque libidinis virus et lacteae sordes* (allusion to the white and milky juice of the figs; Koch, 42 adduces *Colum.* 7, 8, 1: *ficulneo lacte, quod emittit arbor*; the interpretation by d'Alès, *Rev. sc. relig.* 1937, 230/1, is wrong) *non ablundi idoneae, quod nec ipsae adhuc aquae laverant* (= purgatae erant). *At ubi sermo dei descendit in carnem . . . quae non lasciviae frondibus, sed sanctimoniae floribus praecingeretur . . . exinde caro . . . alia iam res est, nova emergit*. For similar passages from later writers, cf. Koch, 45/50. Hieron. in *ep.* 22, 19, 2: *figus folia auspicantia pruriginem nuptiarum* certainly copies Tert. More divergent are the observations of Aug., who denies (*de gen. ad litt.* 11, 32) that there was a definite reason why Adam and Eve chose fig-leaves, and in *de gen. contra Manich.* 2, 15, 23 remarks: *folia vero fici pruritum quendam significant, si hoc bene in rebus incorporeis dicitur, quem miris modis animus patitur cupiditate et delec-*

tatione mentiendi (the same reference to the *libido mentiendi* is found *ib.* 2, 21, 32 and in Ambros. *de paradiso* 13, 64/7); more similar again Euagr. *Altercat. Simon. et Theophil.* (31, 6 *seqq.* Bratke): *quando protoplastus Adam in transgressionem suam folia ficus pudenda contexuit, quae fuit prurigo et amaritudo peccati*. We may add several passages in which this association of the fig-leaves and the *pruritus* is found (but in which the *pruritus* is not described as the cause of the voluptuousness, as by Tert. and Hieron.), viz. Ambros. *de virgin.* 1, 1, 3 (*ficus = illecebrosa deliciarum prurigo mundi*); Hippolyt. *frag. in Genes.* 3 (*ad Gen.* 3, 7, p. 53 Achelis): Φύλλα συκῆς ἐποίει ἑαυτῷ περιζώματα, σύμβολα τῶν ἰδίων ἀμαρτημάτων· φύλλον γὰρ συκῆς ἡνίκα ἂν τοῦ σώματος ἄψηται, κνησημονὴν παρέχει. αὐτὸς οὖν ἑαυτῷ προφῆτης τῶν μελλόντων ἔλεγχον τῆς παραβάσεως τὴν κνησημονὴν δείκνυσιν; Method. *sympos.* 10, 5 (126, 24 *seqq.* Bonwetsch): τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ διάβολος ἤγρευσε, τὴν γύμνωσιν καλύψαι πείσας τοῦ σώματος πετάλοις συκῆς, ὃ ἐστὶ διὰ τὸ κνησιμῶδες τρυφῇ φιληδόνῳ. More similar to Tert.'s view are the words of Petr. Chrysol., *serm.* 106 (496 C): (Adam) *cuius ficus non velabat, sed stimulabat pudorem*. A counterpart of these speculations is found in the symbolism attaching to the willow, for which cf. H. Rahner, *Die Weide als Symbol der Keuschheit* (Ztschr. f. Kathol. Theol. 56 (1932), 231/53). It is evident that *ficulneae* should be connected with *contagionis* (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 44 wrongly assumes an ellipsis of *vestis* after *ficulneae*). — *accingit* refers to the περίζωμα of Adam and Eve: the fig-leaves are the *forma primordialis* of the *prurigo* (Hieron., *loc. cit.*: *ficus folia auspicantia pruriginem nuptiarum*); hence the *prurigo* may function as a girdle no less than the fig-leaves. The sentence may be paraphrased in the following way: “et genitalia accingit cingulo pruriginis, cuius forma primordialis fuit voluptas orta ex contagione foliorum ficulneorum quibus Adam et Eva accincti sunt”. It is from this context that the expression *vestitio sexus* at the beginning of this sentence should be explained. — *de . . . integritatis*: cf. *mon.* 17 *ex.*: *semel gustavit ille de arbore, semel concupivit, semel pudenda protexit . . . semel ruborem suum abscondit, semel de paradiso sanctitatis exulavit*. — *scabida*: Tp; for the association with concupiscence, cf. e. g. Martial. 6, 37, 4 and 11, 7, 6; Aug. *de ord.* 1, 8, 24: *scabiem voluptatum*; *confess.* 9, 1, 1: *scabiem libidinum*; [Cypr.] *de aleat.* 2, 6. For the use of *in*, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 39/40. In the present passage the choice of this adjunct. is of course due to the preceding *prurigne*. — *delinquendi* is certainly the correct reading; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 21/4, for adjectives followed by a genit., especially *idoneus* (*delinquendi* is wrongly written instead of *delinquenti* in *apol.* 45, 5; cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 58/9). — *non . . . vitio*: cf. the discussion on *natura* and *culpa* in 52, 2.

3. *proprie . . . solummodo*: this may be a reminiscence (but no more than that) of the Epicurean doctrine of the ἐπιθυμία φυσική (Usen., *Epic.*, *frag.* 454 *seqq.*, especially 456; Tert. knows two of the κύρια δόξα, cf. the note on 42, 1). The instability of Tert.'s views about this matter is shown by a comparison with ch. 16, where, in his con-

futation of Plato, he asserts that the ἐπιθυμητικόν may be made subservient to a good purpose. At any rate, it should not be forgotten that Tert.'s discussion is primarily based on Holy Scripture; we may also take into account the Stoic view (*St. V. F.* 3, frag. 706) that the desire of simple nourishment is to be regarded as natural. The classification of the ἐπιθυμίαι by Basilides' son Isidorus (cf. Lietzmann, *Gesch. d. alt. Kirche*, 1, 304; Quispel, 28) was undoubtedly influenced by Epicurus, as is Nemes. *de nat. hom.* 18 (p. 221 Matth.): τῶν δὲ σωματικῶν καλουμένων ἡδονῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσὶν ἀναγκαῖαι ἅμα καὶ φυσικαί, ὧν χωρὶς ζῆν ἀδύνατον· ὡς αἱ τροφαὶ αἱ τῆς ἐνδείας ἀναπληρωτικαὶ καὶ τὰ ἐνδύματα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα. — *edetis*: φάγη LXX, *comede* Vulg.; here the plural is caused by *vobis* in the subsequent quotation. — *geniturae*: not 'generation' (cf. 23, 5), but 'creatura', as is evident from *post diluvium*. — *supermensus*: ἄ. λ. — *ecce . . . faeni*: a paraphrase, not a quotation; a faithful translation is given in *iei.* 4 (278, 14/5): *erunt . . . vobis in escam; velut cholera faeni dedi vobis universa*. — *olera faeni*: LXX λάχανα χόρτου, Vulg. *olera virentia* (Hier. *adv. Iovin.* 1, 5: *olera herbarum*). — *prospectam* is certainly right (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.* 2, 33 wavers between this reading and *prospecta*, which would have to refer to *omnia*): the *concupiscentia alimentorum* guarantees the conservation of mankind; for *prospicere*, cf. 20, 3. — *Auferenda . . . occasio*: this refers to Soranus, cf. 6, 6: *animam . . . ali*; a comparison of these two passages shows the opportunism of Tert.'s arguments: in 6, 6, where he combats Platonism, he makes use of Soranus' assertion (though he rejects his opinion about the mortality of the soul, but without saying that the one thesis serves as an argument for the other, which would have weakened his position in that argumentation), whereas here, where there are no further dangers to be feared, he refutes it. For other contradictions in Tert.'s works, see the list given by Koch in his art. 'Tert.' in the R. E. The genit. instead of the dat. (which, however, might give rise to ambiguity) is remarkable, cf. the note on 6, 3, and, for the use of *occasio*, 24, 12; perhaps we have a reminiscence here of 2 Cor. 11, 12: ἵνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελούντων ἀφορμὴν (Vulg.: *ut amputem occasionem eorum*). *argumentator* (also c. *Chr.* 24, 19) is Tp (-trix, *spect.* 2 (2,16) ἄ. λ.); afterwards it is used by Aug. and Boeth., always *in malam partem* (cf. the note on 2, 5 for *argumentatio*). For *sustineatur*, cf. *fulciri* 6, 6 (with the note). — *derogatis*, a law term, is also found in *adv. Marc.* 1, 21 (317, 22); *ad nat.* 1, 10, 37; in a similar context 48, 3: *de cibis distinguendis vel derogandis*. — *evigescat*: ἄ. λ. (*evigoratus* *pall.* 4, 3, *apol.* 17, 5 is used by Tert. only).

4. *cui* (≈ *propter se*) 'for whose sake', cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 44/7 and the note on 12, 3: *cui nihil patitur*. — *si . . . sed*: cf. 32, 9; *quod* instead of an *acc. c. inf.*: cf. 17, 13. — *natura . . . in causam*: *natura* and *proprietas* are opposed to *necessitas* and *causa*, cf. in the next sentence *ex causa necessitatis . . . ex natura proprietatis*, and *res.* 14 (43, 1/3): *nisi enim homo deliquisset, optimum solummodo deum nosset ex naturae proprietate. at nunc etiam iustum eum patitur ex causae*

necessitate; *adv. Marc.* 2, 11 (350, 22/3): *ita prior bonitas dei secundum naturam, severitas posterior secundum causam*; *v. v.* 9: the distinction of *naturae et causae argumenta*. For *in causam*, cf. Löfst., *Krit.*, 86₁; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 14/8; Waltz., *Ét.*, 342/3 and *comm.*, 260. 320. This argument reasons that the flesh needs the nourishment for itself by nature, the soul only on account of a special reason, viz. because it dwells in the body (of course Tert. is in need of an equivalent for the Greek words *κατὰ συμβεβηχός*; but though he often speaks about *accidens* and *accidentia*, he never has arrived at a clear conception of this idea). — *domus animae caro est*: a very common metaphor. Heinze (*ad Lucr.* III, 772) refers to the use of *σκήνος* by Democritus (e.g. A 152; cf. the note on 51, 4: *corporis scaenam*). In Latin literature it is found from Lucr. 3, 774 (*metuit* (sc. anima) . . . *domus aetatis spatio ne fessa vetusto / obruat*) downwards; cf. also Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1979, 61/1980, 25. Of course we must also take into account the influence of 2 Cor. 5, 1 (*terrena domus nostri tabernaculi*), a passage often quoted by Tert. (*res.* 41 (85, 5); *ib.* 46 (95, 2); *pub.* 20 (268, 5/6): *de domo hominis nostri*). — *inquilinus*: repeated in *res.* 46 (95, 12/3): *quia et anima . . . inquilina est carnis*, cf. also Arnob. 2, 37: *homines . . . terreni . . . corporis inquilini*; Beck, 110.

5. *Desiderabit itaque*, etc.: the argument is elliptical, as is shown by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 22/3; the complete form would be: 'atqui desiderabit inquilinus profutura domui; itaque et anima profutura corpori desiderabit'; cf. 9, 5. — *ex causa et necessitate*: cf. the note on § 4. — *profutura*: perhaps the fut. is due to *desiderabit* ('perseverierendes Futurum', cf. 10, 5), but we must not lose sight of the fact that *profuturus* seems sometimes to be used as a substitute for the missing present part. of *prodesse* (the substitution being facilitated by the sense of the verb); cf. my note on *carm. de resurr.* 198. A good example is furnished by Amm. Marc. 21, 10, 5: *quo . . . cuncta disponderet suis utilitatibus profutura* ∞ 21, 11, 3: *futurae concertationi praeparabant utilia* (in the first sentence *utilia*, in the second *profutura* would cause an ungraceful reiteration); for the counterpart, viz. *nociturus* = *nocens*, cf. Svénn., *Pallad.*, 430. — *inquilinatus*: Tp, certainly from Jct (*cod. Theodos.* 12, 19, 2; *cod. Justin.* 11, 66 (65), 6). — *substruendus*: a technical term taken from architecture, just as *loricare* and *tibicinare*; in a more general sense the word is found in *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (347, 20). — *loricandus*: 'to be plastered': Varro *r. r.* 1, 57, 1: *parietes et solum opere tectorio marmorato loricandi*; cf. Vitruv. 7, 1, 4: *supra loricae ex calce et arena inducantur*; *ib.* 7, 9, 4; Plin. *n. h.* 30, 89. Rönsch, *Sem.* 3, 57, wrongly translates the verb in this passage by 'to provide with a parapet'. A different sense is found in *iei.* 12 (290, 24): *cute loricatus* (cf. Plin. *n. h.* 8, 88: (animal) *se coriis loricavit*; Auson. *carm.* 334, 101: *tu* (sc. salmo) *loricato squamosus pectore*; Pass. VII monach. 4 (109, 8/10 Petschenig): *bis acutum genus frumenti . . . manente furfuris cortice loricatum*). — *tibicinandus*: the only other instance of this meaning seems to be found in *schol. ad Iuvenal.* 3, 193: *urbem tenui tibicine fullam*] *tibicinatam, tamquam tibicine, id*

est materia gracili. Oehler paraphrases: 'carne vestiendus, tamquam lorica, ossibus substruendus, tamquam tibicinibus', which is certainly too far-fetched, for Tert. only wants to embellish the metaphor *domus animae* by three technical terms.

6. *dilapsa domo*: cf. Lucr. 3, 772/5: *quidve foras sibi volt* (sc. anima) *membris exire senectis? an metuit conclusa manere in corpore putri, et domus aetatis spatio ne fessa vetusto obruat?*, to which Heinze adduces Bion (Teles p. 10 Hense): καθάπερ ἐξ οἰκίας . . . οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ σωματίου ἐξοικίζουσι and Sen. ep. 30, 2: *ubi* (sc. in senili corpore) *tamquam in putri aedificio omnis iunctura discluditur . . . circumspiciendum est quomodo exeas.* — *priorum* is the correct reading: the *propria subsidia*, which are mentioned in the sequel, never leave the soul. *proprior* instead of *prior* occurs in the cod. Agobardinus in praescr. 29, 13; cf. cor. 8, 30: *priore* A] *propiore* N R B, *propiore* F; an. 41, 3: *priore*] *proprio* Bmg; apol. 47, 14: *prioribus*] *proprioribus* Fuld.; adv. Marc. 4, 1 (424, 11): *priorum* M G R³] *proprium* R¹. — *propriae* = *suae* (2, 2); for the enumeration, cf. ch. 22. — *rationalitatem*: Tp, *intellectualitatem* ἄ. λ. (but the word occurs in medieval Latin, cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 149₂); *sensualitatem*: cf. 17, 2. The present passage was imitated by Vincentius Victor (Aug. de anim. et ei. orig. 2, 4, 8): *Numquid quia anima . . . aut cibum quaerit aut potum, ad ipsam transire credimus pastum? . . . Unde intelligitur . . . et probatur, non ad animam pertinere ciborum sustentacula, sed ad corpus . . . Quid autem putamus in quili n u m quemquam suae habitationi p r o s p i c e r e ? Nonne si eam senserit aut tecto tremere, aut nutare pariete, aut labare fundamine, destinans quaerit, strues congerit, quibus imminentem possit ruinam sedulo diligenterque fulcire, ne sub periculo mansionis discrimen videatur pendere mansori? Ita ergo et animam recognosce . . . carni suae desiderare cibum, ex qua ipsum concipit sine dubio desiderium.*

39. The 'obscuraton' of the soul by the Evil Spirit.

"All the natural faculties of the soul are obscured and corrupted by the devil; for to every man clings the Evil Spirit, who lies in wait for the soul from the moment of birth, and who is actually invited by the superstitious practices which in pagan civilisation centre around the new-born child (§ 1). All these practices form part of the worship of pagan gods, for which reason they partake of idolatry and are associated with demons (§ 2). Such a demon dwelled in Socrates, and such a demon is the *genius* whom everybody is said to possess; therefore everybody, at any rate every pagan, is impure at birth (§ 3). In the case of Christians the situation is slightly different, for, according to 1 Cor. 7, 14, the apostle regards such children as are born from mixed marriages as not altogether impure, i. e. as destined for salvation: they are privileged in having one Christian parent; however, by saying so he does by no means deny that baptism is necessary to attain complete purity (§ 4)".

The enumeration of pagan customs in § 2 has undoubtedly been taken from Varro, as is proved by similar passages from Augustine (see comm.), who explicitly mentions Varro as his source: all the rest, for which we may adduce numerous parallels from Tert.'s other works, may be ascribed to Tert. himself.

1. Cf. for this paragraph 41, 4: (anima) *excipitur etiam a spiritu sancto* (sc. in baptismo), *sicut in pristina nativitate a spiritu profano*. This idea is a very common one, cf. e. g. Orig. *homil. in Exod.* 8, 4 (225, 12 seqq. Baehrens); Optat. Milev. *de schism. Donat.* 4, 6: *nam neminem fugit, quod omnis homo qui nascitur, quamvis de parentibus Christianis nascatur, sine spiritu immundo esse non possit, quem necesse sit ante salutare lavacrum ab homine excludi* (sc. in exorcismo) *et separari*; Aug. *c. Iulian. Peleg.* 2, 1, 3: *quamvis hominum nemo mundus nascatur, et ideo donec mundetur spiritu sancto, sub spiritu immundo esse cogatur*; cf. also the note on § 4 ex. — **nativitus**: cf. 12, 1. — **idem**: from the sequel it appears who is meant (*spiritus nequam*); cf. the note on 28, 2: *Samius sophista . . . ille Pythagoras*. — **qui . . . invidit**: from Sap. 2, 24: *φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*; cf. the note on 20, 5: *diabolus aemulus* and Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 29. — **obumbrat**: this verb is very a common one in Tert.'s works (*ad nat.* 2, 9, 2; *res.* 33 (72, 22); *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 19); 3, 18 (406, 10/1); 4, 28 (516, 14/5); *praescr.* 14, 4; *cor.* 8, 25; *fuga* 5, 2; *apol.* 47, 3; *an.* 45, 6); for this passage, cf. 41, 2. — **depravat**: similarly, *cor.* 6, 13/5: *dei aemulus universam conditionem . . . cum ipso homine corrumpit*; *an.* 16, 7; *spect.* 2 (3, 1/8): the devil as *interpolator*. — **quominus**: in general this word is rarely found in late Latin, but it is common in Arnob. (as an archaism) and in Cypr. and Lact., who make a very liberal use of it (Hofm., *Synt.*, 788). In Cypr.'s works it occurs (Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 117/8) "nicht nur nach den Verben des Verhinderns, Abhaltens, Widerstrebens usw. — negiert oder nicht negiert — sondern auch bei andern, welche nur eine entfernte Aehnlichkeit mit diesen aufzeigen. Jedenfalls hat es durchgehends finale Funktion". The same holds good for Tert., so that sometimes editors write *quo minus* in two words; cf. e. g. *apol.* 47, 3: *neque satis credentes divina esse* (sc. *digesta nostra*), *quominus* (q. m. Martin) *interpolarent* ('pour ne pas les altérer' Waltz., *comm.* 297); *mon.* 10: *praeculcandum est mulierem magis defuncto marito teneri, quominus* (q. m. Oehl.) *aliud virum admittat*; *c. Chr.* 21, 36/7; *adv. Marc.* 2, 25 (370, 8); *fuga* 5, 1; *ad nat.* 1, 10, 36, etc. — **prospiciantur** = *curentur*, cf. 20, 3. — **administrentur**: cf. 14, 4; *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (347, 28): *a quo non ut debuit administrata est* (sc. *libertas arbitrii*). — **adhaerebit spiritus nequam**: the choice of this verb shows that a δαίμων πάρεδρος (see the note on 28, 5) is meant as in 1, 4: *daemonium illi* (sc. Socrati) *a puero adhaesisse* (cf. the note on that passage). For Tert.'s habit of mentioning the devil (here: *idem . . . invidit*), as the 'sum total of all demons', and the single demons alternatively, see the note on 57, 2. — **ianua . . . nativitatis**: for *limen vitae* (*lucis*) as a designation of birth in Latin poetry (from Verg. *Aen.* 6, 427/8 downwards), see Henry, *Aeneidea*,

3, 314/6, for *ianua (limen) leti (mortis)*, my note on *carm. de resurr.* 75; for *nativitas* 'birth', cf. the comm. on 11, 6. — **animas aucupabundus**: Junius' conjecture *animae* is certainly wrong, for Tert. considers forms ending in — *bundus* to be strictly equivalent to the present part., cf. e. g. 34, 5: *non latens, non fallens, non cavillabundus*. With an accus. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 40 (560, 24/5): *spiritus . . . propheticus, velut iam contemplabundus dominum*; cf. *ib.* 4, 15 (466, 11/2): *comminabundus et alibi nobilibus et superbis*. The first instances of the use of an acc. after these forms occur in Sisenna (*frag.* 55, 56) and Sallust (*hist. frag.* 3, 37); cf. C. F. W. Müller, *Nom. u. Akk.*, 158 *seq.* It is extremely frequent in Apul. (cf. also Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 260 and Médan, 35); we may add Mart. Cap. 803: *virginem . . . conspicabunda*; for Iulius Valerius, cf. Fassbender, 65. In *adv. Marc.* 3, 7 (387, 4), Dan. 7, 14 λατρεύουσα is translated by *famulabunda* (Vulg. *servient*). As to the sense, cf. Ps. 123, 7: *anima nostra sicut passer erepta est de laqueo venantium*; *ib.* 58, 4: *aucupaverunt* (Psalt. Veron.; *ceperunt* Vulg.; ἐθάρπυσαν LXX) *animam meam*; Prov. 6, 5; Jer. 5, 26. In patristic literature this metaphor is a very common one, e. g. Aug. in Ps. 139, 12: *auceps animarum*; Pelag. *ad Coloss.* 2, 23; Hier. *homil. Orig. in Ezech.* 7; *comm. in Amos* 8, 1; [Cypr.] *de sing. cler.* 10 (185, 12/4 H.): *omnis inconveniens sodalitas mulierum gluten est delictorum et viscum toxicatum quo diabolus aucupatur*; Vict. Vit. 2, 31; [Vict. Vit.] *pass. VII monach.* 8; Prud. *perist.* 5, 79: (spiritus) *vestrae . . . salutis aucipes*; *Hamart.* 139 *seqq.*; 804/823; *Cathem.* 3, 41/5; Aug. *civ. dei* 8, 20; Caes. Arelat. *serm.* 237, 2 Morin; see also the note on 1, 3: *inviscatas . . . palmas*. On the other hand, Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 107 praises Petrus of Ravenna as an *auceps animarum*. — **qua**: Hartel supposes *quia*, whereas Ihm (Thes. I. L. II: 1237, 43/6) proposes to insert another *qua* before *ab ipsa*. Both conjectures are superfluous, the function of *qua* only being the stressing of the causal sense of *invitatus* (the preceding part. *aucupabundus* does not have this sense, but functions as an attributive adjective); cf. 5, 2; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 42/3; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 134/5; Löfst., *Per.*, 126. — **invitatus**: an exact parallel is found in *spect.* 12 (15, 5/8): *quod purpurae, quod fascies, quod vittae* (cf. here § 2 *infulis*), *quod coronae . . . sine pompa diaboli, sine invitatione daemonum non sunt*; cf. also *apol.* 23, 1 and Caes. Arelat. *serm.* 193, 1 Morin: *sic enim fit, ut stultae laetitiae causa, dum observantur Kalendarum dies aut aliarum superstitionum vanitas . . . velut ad sacrificia sua daemones invitentur*.

2. **idololatria obstetrice**: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 12, 16: *hunc vobis patriarcham deorum Caelum et Terra poetis obstetricantibus procreaverunt*; *mon.* 16: *adducet* (sc. Antichristus) *illis* (viz. to those who in such critical times still beget children) *carnifices obstetrices*; Priscill. *tract.* 1 (17, 19/20 Schepss): *nos ecclesia matre editi et sapientia obstetricante producti*. Similarly, *mon.* 4: *sed et reformatio secundi generis humani monogamia matre censetur*. Cf. Tert.'s words on marriage in *cor.* 13, 26/7: *idololatrian . . . a qua apud illos nuptiae incipiunt*. — **dum ipsi . . . profitentur**: the *infulae* must be ribbons, which were used as amulets; such are mentioned by Clem. Alex. *protrept.* 1, 10, 2: σὺ δὲ εἰ ποθεῖς ἰδεῖν

ὥς ἀληθῶς τὸν θεόν, καθαρσίῳν μεταλάμβανε θεοπρεπῶν, οὐ δάφνης πετάλων καὶ ταινιῶν τινῶν ἐρίῳ καὶ πορφύρᾳ πεποικιλμένῳ. For the use made of red strings or ribbons as amulets for women in childbed or for pregnant woman in other civilisations, cf. E. Wunderlich, *Die rote Farbe*, etc. (R V V XX 1), 29/30; for an exact parallel from German folklore, cf. Wuttke-Meyer, *Deutscher Volksaberglaube*³, 142 (§ 195) and 181 (§ 246). From Greek and Roman civilisations no parallels are known; perhaps *S H A Clod. Albin.* 5, 9 may be referred to: *accessit omen quod, cum pueri eius familiae russulis fasciis inligarentur, quod forte lotae atque udae essent russulae fasciolae, quas mater praegnas paraverat, purpurea matris inligatus est fascea*; for the woollen strings (ἐρίᾱ) which in Attica were attached to the door after the birth of a child, cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 72₁. Noteworthy is the information given by La Cerda that in his time (first half of the seventeenth century) in Spain the bellies of pregnant women were wrapped round "corrigia S. Augustini vel fune S. Francisci". A very peculiar interpretation of the present passage is given by Blümner (*Privataltert.*, 300): "Die jedenfalls hygienischen Zwecken dienenden Binden, mit denen sich die schwangern Frauen den Leib umwickelten, wurden vorher im Tempel der Lucina geweiht"; *ib.*, note 5: "Tert. de an. 39; mit diesen Binden wurde nach der Geburt der Lucina eine ganze Woche lang ein Opfertisch gedeckt; s. ebd." — *apud idola*: cf. *cor.* 13, 49/51: *et in omnibus istis* (sc. officiis saeculi) *idololatriae, in solo quoque censu* (i. e. origine) *coronarum, quibus omnia ista redimita sunt*. — *daemoniorum candidata*: this use of *candidatus* as an adj. followed by a genit. is remarkable. In *Thes. l. L. III*: 238, 78/81 the present passage is associated with *cod. Theodos.* 6, 4, 22, 2: *ex ordine candidato* and *ib.* 14, 10, 1: *ordinis candidati*; so it is possible that for this use as an adj. the influence of the idiom of lawyers should be taken into account (but cf. *ib.* 237, 16 *seqq.*); see also *bapt.* 10, 5 with Borleffs' critical note. In Tert.'s works *candidatus* is frequently followed by a genit., e. g. *cor.* 7, 59: *c. -is diaboli*; *orat.* 3 (182, 24); *ad ux.* 2, 7; *adv. Marc.* 2, 25 (371, 5); *adv. Iud.* 2, 85; *res.* 58 (119, 10). Cf. also Beck, 130₂; Gabler, 53; for Hier., see Bickel, *Diatr.*, 251. — *in partu*... *advocantur*: quoted by Agahd, 168, as Varro *Rer. divin.* XIV frag. 15. — *Lucinae et Dianae*: cf. Wissowa, *Rel.*, 183₁ and 248; for the identification of Lucina with Diana, see Kroll's note on Catull. 34, 13/4. — *hebdomadem* (A) is the correct reading, cf. e. g. 48, 4: *trium hebdomadum statione*. *hebdomas* means ἡ ἐπτάς in Tert.'s works (e. g. *adv. Iud.* 8, 116). — *Iunoni mensa proponitur*: Wissowa (*op. cit.*, 183₃) refers to *schol. Bern. ad Verg. eclog.* 4, 62: *nobilibus pueris editis in atrio domus Iunoni Lucinae lectus, Herculi mensa ponebatur*, "wo die Nennung des lectus statt der mensa und die Erwähnung des Hercules auf jüngere Kultform hinweist". Since Tert. is frequently inaccurate, especially when reporting data from domains uncongenial to him (cf. the note on 46, 5 and Lortz, *Tert.*, 1, 265₁₂₂), it is quite possible that in the present passage he mixes up the *lectus Herculis* and the *mensa Iunonis*, which he regards as equally contemptible. Perhaps we must also take into account Macrobius *Sat.* 3, 11, 5/6: *in Papiriano*... *iure evidenter*

relatum est arae vicem praestare posse mensam dicatam. ut in templo, inquit, Iunonis Populoniae augusta (i. e. sacrata: cf. H. Wagenvoort, Imperium (Amsterdam 1941), 15) mensa est. On hebdomadem K. Latte (R. E. XIII, 1649, s. v. 'Lucina') observes: "hebdomas bei Tert. wohl für älteren Zeitraum von neun Tagen eingetreten, also von der Geburt bis zum dies lustricus (Macrobian. 1, 16, 36)". However, Macrobius writes: est autem lustricus dies quo infantes lustrantur et nomen accipiunt, sed is maribus nonus, octavus est feminis, so that it seems preferable to speak of a period of eight days in the first case, of seven in the second (cf. also Paulus ex Festo s. v. lustricus dies). — ultima die, i. e. the lustricus dies, which was also called Nominalia (idol. 16 = 49, 18/9). — The Fata Sribunda are mentioned in the present passage only. Wissowa in this connection (op. cit., 264/6) refers to C. E. L. 1164, 5/6: quo matri multos scripsit (sc. Parca), multos quoque patri . . . annos; cf. also ib. 1332, 2: reliquis totidem annis vixi bene, ut Fata scripsere mihi. It should, however, be noticed that this conception of writing goddesses is always associated with the moment of birth, cf. also Sen. Consol. ad Marc. 21, 6: habebit quisque quantum illi dies primus adscripsit. The Tria Fata (who are certainly identical to the Tres Parcae, cf. e. g. Fulgent. Mitol. 1, 8 (21, 7 Helm): tria etiam ipso Plutoni destinant Fata, quarum prima Cloto, etc.) are mentioned from Plaut. Bacch. 953 downwards (cf. Usener, Rh. Mus. N. F. 58 (1903), 12). For the T. F. depicted in the so-called crypt of Vincentius, cf. J. Wilpert, Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms (Freiburg i. B. 1903), 392 (ib., note 3, he proves Maass (Orpheus, 221) to be wrong in regarding one of these Fata as 'a male Fatum, a Fatus'; a Fatus, however, is mentioned in an inscription from Rome, cf. Konjetzny, 301). F. Messerschmidt, Die schreibenden Gottheiten in der etruskischen Religion (A R W 29 (1931), 60/9), refers to the representations of writing Parcae in images of the birth or creation of human beings (e. g. on the famous 'sarcophagus of Prometheus' in the Museo Capitolino, cf. Robert, Sarkoph., 3, 355; Helbig, Führer³, 792). However, as I observed already, these representations of writing gods can hardly contribute anything to the interpretation of the present passage; this is also pointed out by Wissowa (op. cit., 266 and note 1), who, moreover, rightly remarks (ib. 266₂) that, as fatum must certainly be derived from f a r i, a conception of writing Fata only became possible, when the original meaning of the name was no longer felt, whence it cannot be so old as the use of scribunda instead of scribentia seems to infer. Moreover, it should be remembered that such gerundives as in early Latin were used as present participles, e. g. volvendus, sequendus, oriundus, belong to deponent verbs (cf. Leumann, 226; Neue Wagener, 3, 128; Sommer, 615; Persson, Gerund., 93). A seeming exception is found in the names of the four goddesses Deferenda, Commolenda, Coinquenda and Adolenda, who are invoked in the Acta fratrum Arvalium, when a tree is to be removed; but according to H. Wagenvoort, Imperium, 80/1, these names originally referred to the tree which was to be cut down, so that the meaning would be passive (a similar interpretation was given by J. Weisweiler, Jahrb.

f. Philol. 139 (1889), 48, whose view was combated by Wissowa, *Abhandl.*, 310₃; Peter in Roscher 2, 189 *seq.*; Stolz, A. L. L. 10, 158 *seqq.*; see Wagenvoort, *op. cit.*, 80₃). Such a passage as Commod. *instr.* 2, 1, 46 *credendos* (= *-entes*) does not amount to anything. To my knowledge, an exact parallel to the name *Fata Scribunda* is only found in the name of the goddess *Afferenda*, who is mentioned by Tert. in a passage that was undoubtedly copied from Varro (*ad nat.* 2, 11, 12): *Afferenda est ab afferendis dotibus ordinata* (Weisweiler, *loc. cit.*, doubts whether the name has been correctly transmitted; Wagenvoort, *op. cit.*, 80₃, takes into account the possibility that Tert. does not reproduce its meaning in the right way). Knowing that Varro used such forms himself (e. g. *adolescendus* = *adolescens*, Gell. 3, 10, 10; see Neue-Wagener, *loc. cit.*, and Leo's note on *Culex* 260), we may perhaps assume that the form *Fata Scribunda* owes its existence to Varro. — *Statinae*: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 11, 8: *et statuendi infantis Statina* (Oehl. Borleffs; A only has *sta* followed by a lacune of 20 letters; *Statilina* Gothofredus); Aug. *civ. dei* 4, 21 (from Varro: Agahd, 79₁): *commendare . . . deo Statilino stantes*. Agahd proposes to read *Statilinae* in the present passage, which may be right. Cf. also Non. Marc. s. v. *Statilinus* and *Statanus*. — *sacrum*: for the use of the neuter, cf. the note on 27, 9.

3. *reatus*, just as *delictum* (see the note on 16, 2), is used in the sense of 'sin'; cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 77; Beck, 126; Mossberg, 83/4; Médan, 152. — *crinem*: probably Tert. has in mind the Greek habit of offering up locks of hair to the gods, for instance at the festival called *μείον*, which formed part of the *Apaturia* (mentioned by him in *apol.* 39, 15). Cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 17₁; Stengel, *Gr. Kultusaltertümer*², 84; Samter, *Familienfeste*, 22; 45/6; 58; 65; 71₄; 72; 77; Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 107; L. Sommer, *Das Haar in Religion und Aberglauben* (Münster i. W. 1912), 79; Hitzig-Blümner's note on Pausan. 1, 37, 3. In Roman civilisation this custom seems to have been a much less common one (cf. Petron. 107, 15; Martial. 1, 31, 1/2; 9, 17, 5; *Anthol. Lat.* 742, 15). — *sacrificio . . . saero*: cf. *ad nat.* 1, 15, 1: *sacrificii vel sacri*. — *obligat*, sc. *caput* (though *crinem* is halfway between the two words; for similar cases, see Sjögren, *Eran.* 19 (1919/20), 159). Cf. e. g. Quint., *declam. min.* p. 371, 21 Ritt.: *cum ad probationem rei caput suum obligaret*. For *obligat*, cf. *idol.* 2 (31, 24/5): *si quis aut incendat aut immolet aut polluceat aut sacris aliquibus aut sacerdotiis obligetur*; *apol.* 21, 29; *spect.* 10 (13, 14). For this consecration of children to gods, cf. Xenophon *Ephes.* 3, 11 (Isis); Donat. *ad Ter. Phormio* 1, 1, 15; *C. I. L.* 6, 751b (Mithras); Kaibel, *Epigr.* 153; D. Oepke in *Festschrift Ihmels* (1928), 84/100. — *Socraten*: cf. the note on 1, 5. — *daemonicus* (Tp) is found in Christian literature only. — *genii . . . daemonum*: this identification is found from *Apul. de deo Socr.* 15 and *de Plat.* 1, 12 (96, 13 Thom.) downwards; cf. the passages collected in Thes. l. L. VI: 1830, 48 *seqq.*, to which we may add Min. Fel. 29, 5; Serv. *ad georg.* 3, 417; Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 95. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 32, 2: *nescitis genios daemones dici, et inde diminutiva voce daemonia?* — *munda*: see the note on 40, 1.

4. The best commentary on this passage is given by Hier. *ep.* 85, 5, 12: *De secundo problemate tuo* (sc. quomodo sancti sint, qui de fidelibus, id est, baptizatis nascuntur, cum sine dono gratiae postea acceptae et custoditae salvi esse non possint) *Tertullianus in libris de monogamia disseruit, asserens sanctos dici fidelium filios, quod quasi candidati sint fidei, et nullis idolatriae sordibus polluantur. Idioma igitur scripturarum est, ut interdum sanctos pro mundis et purificatis atque expiatis nominent.* According to Bickel, *Diatrise in Sen. fragm.*, 251, Hier. here refers to Tert.'s lost treatise *Ad amicum philosophum*; Harnack, too (*Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Akad.* 1895, 570), though he quotes the present passage from *De anima*, supposes that Hier. alludes to a lost work. The right solution was already given by Rigaltius: Hier. wrongly wrote *De monogamia* instead of *de anima*. The context in the passage under consideration is not particularly clear; we might elucidate it by the following paraphrase: "Practically nobody is completely pure at birth, i. e. among pagans. <On the other hand, children born from two Christian parents are to a certain extent privileged on account of their origin (*seminis praerogativa*): they are at least not altogether impure, but destined to be pure (*designati sanctitatis*), which purity they actually attain by baptism.> For the apostle this was an occasion to point out that <also> children born from mixed marriages are destined to be pure and so to be saved; by this statement he wanted to retain such marriages (cf. 1 Cor. 7, 12: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς λέγω ἐγώ, οὐχ ὁ κύριος· εἴ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἔχει ἄπιστον καὶ αὕτη συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀφίετω αὐτήν, etc.). But by saying so he by no means intended to deny that, according to God's determination (*dominicae definitionis*, as opposed to the words λέγω ἐγώ, οὐχ ὁ κύριος), baptism is essential to attain complete purity". Up to baptism every soul is impure (*immunda* 40,1; Klein, 349 (note 264) is probably right in assuming that the famous words *Fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani* (*apol.* 18,4) must be explained as a reference to baptism), for it is subject to original sin (for the seeming contradiction between 39, 3: *nulla ferme nativitas munda est*, which bears upon the influence of the demons, and 40, 1: *omnis anima... immunda*, which refers to original sin, see the note on 41,1); but 'Christian souls' have a privileged position on account of their origin and their (Christian) instruction (*ex institutionis disciplina*). Cf. also the discussion on this passage by d'Alès, *Théol.*, 265. The apostle's words: *ceterum immundi nascerentur* contain the central point of the whole discussion: "without this privilege children born from mixed marriages would be completely impure and on a level with pagans. Still they are only destined to be saved, which they are not yet: they attain salvation by baptism only". — Hine: for if it were not for the fact that *nulla ferme nativitas munda est*, it would not have been necessary to say that *sancti* spring from mixed marriages. — *sanctos*: for St. Paul ἅγιοι is "almost a technical designation of Christians" (Dibelius on Coloss. 1, 1/2), who become *sancti* in consequence of baptism; cf. for instance Pelag. *ad Ephes.* 1, 1: *possunt etiam catechumini, ex eo quod Christo credunt, fideles dici, non tamen*

sancti sunt, quia non sunt per baptismum sanctificati. — *praerogativa* is a very common word in Tert.'s works; note the frequent occurrence of law terms in this passage: *candidata* § 2; *designatos*; *pignore*. — *designatos . . . salutis* (*saluti* Urs. Rig.): the genit. should be retained, cf. *iei.* 5 (279, 11): (*populus*) *terrae lacte et melle manantis destinatus* (B, cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 10; *mananti* Gel. Oehl. Reiff.); *adv. Iud.* 5, 44 (the dat. is found in *res.* 47 (98, 14); on *cull. fem.* 2, 7, 2: *gehennae destinati*, a decision is impossible). Cf. also *paneg.* 6, 4, 1: *sacrum istud palatium non candidatus imperii, sed designatus intrasti*. For *sanctitatis designatus* Tert. might have written *sanctus designatus* on the analogy of *martyr designatus*, for *salutis designatus*: *salvus designatus* (Teeuwen, 98). As to the contents of this passage, cf. Petr. Chrysol. *serm.*, *append.* 4 (673 B): *vocate* (sc. catechumeni) *ergo Dominum Patrem, vosque, etsi nondum natos, iam tamen designatos filios credite.* — *filios*: 'children', cf. the note on 5, 4. — *censuerat*, sc. in the preceding (hence the pluperf.) passage (1 Cor. 7, 12). — *Alioquin*: 'for the rest', not 'in another case', as this word was sometimes translated in this context (cf. d'Alès, *Théol.*, 265₆). Cf. *praescr.* 26, 32/4, where Tert. wants to preclude dangerous conclusions: *Alioquin meminérant*: '*Sit sermo vester: est est, non non*', nam '*quod amplius, hoc a malo est*', *ne evangelium in diversitate tractarent.* — *inibit A, introibit B* (probably from the Vulgate: *non potest introire*); *bapt.* 13, 3: *nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto, non intrabit in regno caelorum* (B and Borleffs, who refers to Hier. *ep.* 69, 6, 6: *non intrare eum regna caelorum*; see for this reading also Reitzenstein *Z N T W* 15 (1914), 70₂; *introibit* Trecens.). — For Tert.'s interpretation of 1 Cor. 7, 14, cf. Aug. *de peccat. merit. et remiss.* 3, 12, 21, who after considering various possibilities concludes: *illud tamen sine dubitatione tenendum est, quaecumque illa sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Christianos faciendos . . . nisi Christiana et ecclesiastica institutione sacramentis efficiantur fideles.* In *ad ux.* 2, 2 Tert. makes a stand against the inference drawn from 1 Cor. 7, 12/4 by many people that a Christian woman is allowed to marry a pagan. Dölger (*Exorz.*, 42/3) points out rightly (in refutation of Schwane, *Dogmengesch.*, 1², 342) that Tert. did not consider original sin as connected at any rate with the dwelling of an evil demon in man; the present passage does not mention 'Satan dwelling in unbaptized children', as Schwane asserts, but only 'the devil's endeavour to catch the souls'. For 11, 6, which passage, according to Dölger, also points another way, see the comm.

40. *The relation between body and soul in relation to sin; the body is only the instrument of the soul.*

"Up to baptism every soul is subject to original sin and impure; consequently it is sinful, and the sinfulness of the body, too, is due to it (§ 1). For the flesh in itself is not sinful; it is only a tool of the soul (§ 2). So when in Holy Scripture the flesh is blamed on account of evil deeds, in reality this refers to the soul only (§ 3). The condemnation of sinfulness of thought (Matth. 5, 28) points to the same

thing. The merit of good deeds is not attributed to the body either; hence it would be unjust to impute evil deeds to it. So we may take it that in Holy Scripture the censure of the flesh only serves to point out more clearly the charge against the chief offender, i. e. the soul".

1. *omnis . . . recenseatur*: Esser 230/1 paraphrases: "jede Seele sei in Adam eingetragen, bis sie in Christus übertragen werde". Though we must admit that it hardly seems right here to consider *censeri* as a synonym of *nasci* (cf. comm. on 20, 1), as this does not fit in with *eo usque* (unless we have recourse to a rather studied interpretation: "is regarded as having been born in Adam"), it yet seems necessary to interpret the last part of the sentence in the usual way: "till it is reborn in Christ". For *recenseri* = *renasci*, cf. 31, 5 and particularly Hier. *ep.* 60, 8, 2 (who probably imitates the present passage): *ab eo tempore censemur, ex quo in Christo renascimur* (from Tert. cf. *adv. Marc.* 5, 9 (604, 9/10): *qui in ipso* (sc. Christo) *renascuntur*). For the interpretation of *censeri* we must adduce *pud.* 6 (229, 23 sqq.): *luserit ante Christum caro, immo perierit antequam a domino suo requisita est: nondum erat digna dono salutis, nondum apta officio sanctitatis. adhuc in Adam deputabatur cum suo vitio*: the soul "is regarded as <existing still> in Adam", "as still being subject to original sin". For the ellipsis (if we are justified in assuming it), cf. e. g. 16, 5: *non semper ex irrationali* (sc. ὄντα) *censenda sunt indignativum et concupiscentivum*. On the other hand, in *exh. cast.* 5, 22/3: *de uno matrimonio censemur utrobique, et carnaliter in Adam et spiritualiter in Christo, censeri* is a complete equivalent of *oriri*. For this passage cf. also Hier. *adv. Vigilant.* 8: *non enim nascimur, sed renascimur Christiani*. If Tert. here calls every soul impure, this is not the immediate consequence of his argument in 39, 1/3, for he makes a clear distinction between original sin and the sinfulness caused by evil spirits (cf. comm. on 39, 4 for Dölger's discussion and especially the note on 41, 4). The sentence is closely related to the 1 a s t sentence of ch. 39, in which Tert. discusses the being purified from original sin through baptism. There is an unmistakable association with Rom. 5, 12: Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτοῦν. For Tert. the transmission of original sin (which in *de an.* is not discussed in detail) is closely related to traducianism. The most important passage is *test. an.* 3 (138, 4/7): (Satanas) *per quem homo a primordio circumventus, ut praeceptum dei excederet, et propterea in mortem datus exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum suae etiam damnationis traducem fecit*; cf. also *pud.* 6; *iei.* 3 (277, 21/2): *mortis a primordio causam* (sc. concupiscentiam, cf. 38, 2) *in me quoque cum ipso genere transductam*; Laurent. Novar., *homil.* 1 (adduced by Scholte in his note on *test. anim.* 3): *peccatum mundi quid est? delictum Adam per traducem seminis ad filios devolutum*. — *quamdiu*: 'until'. According to Kroymann, *Quaest. Tert.*, 114, the traditional reading is impossible 'quia hic omnino ferri nequit coniunctivus'; however, a subjunctive is found fairly

often after *quamdiu*, when it has this meaning, e. g. Cypr. *ep.* 11, 1 (496, 15 H.): *tamdiu torqueant quamdiu deiciant*; *ib.* 59, 11 (679,3; the remark of Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 133: “*Quamdiu* in der Bedeutung von *quoad* . . . liegt nicht vor” is unaccurate). For more instances, see Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1561, 64 *seqq.*; 1563, 15 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 739; Blatt, 187; Tidn., *Did.*, 197; Junel, 76/7; Kalb, *Roms Jur.*, 52; Liechtenhan, 103; Watson, 298₂. We may add *S H A Probus* 14, 2; *ib.*, *Alex. Sev.* 45, 2; Macrobian. *Somn. Scip.* 1, 18, 11; *Vit. Caes. Arelat.* 1, 45; Veget. 2, 22, 2 (≈ *donec* Chiron 86); moreover, this use of *quamdiu* is particularly frequent in the works of Hier., Aug., and the Ambrosiaster. So there is no reason to adopt the ingenious conjecture by Fr. Leo, *tamdiu in munda, quamdiu in mundo*, which contains a word-play frequently found in Christian literature, e. g. Tert. *ad. mart.* 2: *peiores immunditias expirat mundus*; Avit. *carm.* 6, 157: *mundanas odisse vias, percurrere mundas*; Venant. Fort. *carm.* 3, 23a, 11; 4, 8, 3; *de vita Mart.* 2, 420; Aug. *serm.* 105, 6 and *de agon. Christ.* 31, 33; *evang. Nicod.* II, 6 (22) (p. 379 Tischendorf); cf. also Apul. *Asclep.* 11 (47, 13/4 Thom.): *eumque munde mundum servando*. — *peccatrix* . . . *immunda*: the sinfulness is the consequence of the impurity, which in its turn is caused by the transmission of original sin (for this subject, cf. Courdaveaux, 30₁; Schulze, 85); from this we should distinguish the impurity caused by the devil and the evil spirits, for which cf. 39, 1/3. Thus in 39, 3 the words *adeo nulla ferme nativitas munda est* refer to the pagan customs at the birth of a child and so do not hold good for Christians, whereas in the passage under discussion every soul without exception is meant. — *recipiens ignominiam et carnis* (Lindner; *ex carnis* A) certainly is the most plausible reading. Lindner paraphrases: “*suam habet propriam ignominiam, et carnis etiam in se recipit, quia caro instigante demum anima operatur*”. Only *recipit* is not strictly equivalent to *in se recipit*; we may rather compare Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 5, 8, 5: *ea quae tibi promitto ac recipio*; Caes. *b. civ.* 3, 17, 2 and 3, 82, 5; see also Landgraf’s note on Cic. *pro Rosc. Amer.* 114. Tert. means to say that “the soul guarantees the ignominy <of sin> for the flesh as well” (cf. also Esser, 211₂). Instead of the genit. *carnis* we would expect the dat. (see the note on 6, 3). The reading given by Bmg, which is adopted by Oehler, viz. *respuens ignominiam suam et in carnem*, finds support in *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (347, 27/8): *libertas enim arbitrii non ei culpam suam respuet, a quo data est* and in *spect.* 15 (16, 18/9): *(loca) quae, simul inquinamentum combiberunt, tunc etiam in alteros respuunt*. However, this reading diverges too much from A as to be acceptable. — *societate*: as discussed in 37, 5 and 38, 1.

2. *carnales*: cf. the note on 11, 3. — *notantur*: the addition of the ablat. *infamia* is not necessary, cf. e. g. *adv. Marc.* 3, 8 (388, 26): *quia et de isto notati fuissent*; *ib.* 1, 16 (311, 20); *praescr.* 33, 6. — *sapit* . . . *sentit*: cf. 12, 3/4; *peccatela* is ἀ. λ. — *ministerium* is equivalent here to *minister*; this meaning is found from Tac., Suet., and Plin. min. downwards. From Tert.’s works cf. *apol.* 11, 4 and 39, 2; *ad nat.*

1, 18, 4; *paen.* 12, 8; *cor.* 5, 10; cf. also Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 213/4 and *Krit. Apol.*, 81/2; Fassbender, 27. — **minor amicus**: cf. *Hor. sat.* 2, 1, 61: *maiorum . . . quis amicus*; *Aug. confess.* 6, 11, 18, 19; *S H A Alex. Sev.* 20, 1: *amicos . . . inferiores*; *Anihol. Lat.* 408, 3/4. — **animalia nomina** is interpreted by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 35 as *nomina animalium*, for which he refers to 27, 5: *si frigidum nomen est anima Graecorum* (cf. the note on that passage). Though this interpretation is certainly possible, it is not altogether out of the question that *nomen* here has a stronger sense, and that we must translate these words by 'animated beings'. Already Forcellini quotes examples (s. v. I, 2) in which the word 'metonymice ponitur pro ipsa persona': *Val. Flacc.* 5, 118/9: *nova dux accedere gaudet/nomina*; *Sil. Ital.* 17, 492: *fortissima quaeque/nomina obit ferro* (the passages quoted from Ovid are slightly different); cf. also *Tibull.* 3, 4, 61: *a! crudele genus, nec fidum, femina, nomen!* (Heyne in the index: 'res infida'); for *Sen.*, cf. *Axelsson, N. S. S.*, 211/2. *Tert.*, too, often uses *nomen* in the sense of 'essence of the thing', 'the thing itself', e. g. *apol.* 23, 4: *ostendemus unam esse utriusque nominis* (sc. deorum et daemonum) *qualitatem*, to which *Waltz., comm.*, 171 compares the use of *nomen Romanum* = *Romani* (e. g. *apol.* 25, 2. 3. 12; for *nomen Christianum*, cf. *Lortz*, 1, 68₁₄₄); *v. v.* 1. *totum arboris nomen* (= *totum quod arbor nominari potest* = *tota arbor*); *c. Chr.* 12: *denique sine anima nihil sumus, ne hominis quidem, sed cadaveris nomen*. Also in the discussion of idolatry, which, according to *Tert.*, deifies human beings, because it raises their names to the names of gods (*apol.* 27, 1: *sub imaginum prostitutione et humanorum nominum consecratione*), *nomen* often is almost equivalent to *persona*, e. g. *spect.* 8 (10, 5/6): *quot nomina immunda possederint circum*; for *idol.* 10 (39, 29/30 and 40, 2/3), cf. *Hartel, Patr. Stud.*, 1, 42. This identification is particularly evident in those passages where it is asserted that an evil spirit 'hides itself behind the person of somebody who has died': 57, 5: *spiritus nequam sub personis defunctorum delitiscens* ∞ *Lact. div. inst.* 2, 16, 19: (daemones) *sub nominibus mortuorum delitiscens*. The same inclination to identify the two words is found in discussions on the dogma of the Trinity, cf. *adv. Prax. passim* (e. g. 30 = 288, 8/9), *Novat.* and *Hilar. de trin.* Besides, we often find in Latin of the later period (but also in isolated instances from earlier times: cf. *Vahlen, Opusc. Acad.*, 1, 57/60 for *Enn. scen.* 243) *nomen* connected with the genit. of a name instead of the name by itself; cf. Löfst. *Eran.* 10 (1910), 22/4 (one of the passages quoted, viz. *C. I. L.* XIII, 7555: *dis manibus hos voveo: L. Caelium . . . et si quos alios hostes habeo: neca illa nomina* requires another interpretation: here we should remember the estimation of the name as a representative of the person himself in magic practice; cf. e. g. *Hopfner, Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 177 (§ 693); *Heitmüller, Im Namen Jesu*, 68; *Van der Leeuw, Phänomenologie der Religion*, 129 *seqq.*); *Tidn., Did.*, 14; *Blomgren, Stud. Fort.*, 1, 181; we may add *Merobaud.* 1, frag. 1a (7, 11/3 *Vollm.*): *nec tantum Catones nostri, sed et peregrina Lacedaemoniorum et Atheniensium nomina*; *Claud. Mar. Vict. Aleth.* 2, 310;

1, 409: *nomen plurale deorum* (cf. Arnob. 3, 35: *specialia numinum nomina* and my note on *carm. de resurr. mort.* 395); Auson. *Carm.* 159, 1. For the (slightly different) use of *nomen* in epitaphs (e. g. *C. E. L.* 1307, 1: *dulce istic nomen Glypte iacet*), cf. Armini, *Eran.* 34 (1936), 134. Cf. also Paulin. Pell. 426/7: *nomina . . . cara mihi*; Paulin. *Nol. carm.* 25, 10: *Iuno Cupedo Venus, nomina luxuriae* (cf. in this treatise 1, 2: *philosophus, gloriae animal*; but in Orig. *ap. Hier. c. Io. Hieros.* 25: *Manes, nomen insaniae*, a word-play is found: *Manes-μανία*). For *Vit. Patr.* 6, 2, 8: *quando eram in Scythi cum abbate Macario, ascendimus metere cum eo septem nomina*, cf. Salon., *V. P.*, 416, who refers to the use of ὀνόματα "das beim Zählen im Sinne von „Kopf“, „Mann“, „Person“ im späteren Griechisch häufig belegt ist". For this he compares apoc. 11, 13 *Vulg.*: *et occisa sunt in terrae motu nomina hominum septem milia* (ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες ἑπτὰ); cf. also the note on the Greek text of the *Vit. Patr.*, *loc. cit.* (*P. G.* 34, 244 B), and apoc. 3, 4: ἀλλὰ ἔχεις ὀλίγα ὀνόματα ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἃ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἃ ξιοί εἰσιν (*Vulg. pauca nomina . . . qui*); Ignat. *ad Rom.* 10, 1: Κρόκος, τὸ ποδηγτόν μοι ὄνομα; *ad Smyrn.* 13, 2; *ad Polyc.* 8, 3; more in Deissmann, *Bibelstud.*, 143 seq. and *Neue Bibelstud.*, 24 seq. — **calix**: cf. the exposition in *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (323, 29 seqq.): *sed et si carni delicta reputantur, praecedit animae reatus et culpae principatus animae potius adscribendus, cui caro ministri nomine occurrit. carens denique anima caro hactenus peccat . . . innocentiores substantiam (sc. carnem) . . . obsequio, non arbitrio delinquentem; ib.* 5, 10 (609, 2/5): *venenum dare scelus est, calix tamen, in quo datur, reus non est. ita et corpus carnalium operum vas est, anima est autem, quae in illo venenum alicuius malifacit temperat; ib.* 1, 8/9: *veneficio absoluto calix erit puniendus?* On the other hand, in *res.* 16, where the same image occurs, the importance of the body must be pointed out against those who do not believe in the resurrection of the whole human being (cf. *ib.* 7); therefore in that passage Tert. emphasizes that the flesh, though only an instrument of the soul, is nevertheless tainted by the evil deed; there he combats those who say that the flesh is only *officium*, not *ministra animae*: *dicent enim ministros et socios habere arbitrium ministrandi atque sociandi et potestatem suae voluntatis in utrumque, homines scilicet et ipsos; idcirco cum auctoribus merita communicare, quibus operam sponte accommodarint; carnem autem nihil sapientem, nihil sentientem per semetipsam, non velle non nolle de suo habentem, vice potius vasculi apparere animae, ut instrumentum, non ut ministerium; ib.* (47, 5/7): *homo vero (sc. vocatur caro) de communione naturae, quae eam non instrumentum in operationibus praestat, sed ministerium* (in the passage under discussion the flesh is *min.* (§ 2) as well as *instr.* (§ 3), the main stress being laid on the latter). When his opponents (45, 28/9) make use of the image of the chalice, Tert. replies, though rather forcedly (46, 16/8): *at enim et calix bene sibi conscius et de diligentia ministerii commendatus de coronis quoque potatoris sui inornabitur aut aspergine florum honorabitur.* More like the present passage is *bapt.* 4, 5: *spiritus* (in this treatise

Tert. does not yet make a clear distinction between *anima* and *spiritus*) . . . *dominatur, caro famulatur. Tamen utrumque inter se communicant reatum, spiritus ob imperium, caro ob ministerium*. Tert. was imitated by Hieron. *ad Gal.* 1, 4. To my knowledge, the image of the chalice to denote the body is not found before Tert.; we may perhaps regard it as a variation of the very common denotation of the body as the ἀγγεῖον (for Philo, see Leisegang's index; cf. *vasculum*, *res.* 16) or the σκεῦος (cf. Dibelius' note on 1 Thess. 4, 4) of the soul. — **corpus, non anima** is to be regarded as one subst.; cf. § 3: *non sensibus, sed effectibus* (it is less probable that we should regard *quid aliud eiusmodi* as the subst. and supply ὅν after *anima*).

3. **choico**: this adjunct. occurs for the first time in the *Itala* and in Tert.'s works, cf. *res.* 49 (101, 7; = 1 Cor. 15, 47): *primus homo de terra, choicus* (to which Tert. adds: *id est limacius*; Marcion's Bible had *terrenus* (von Soden, 245); perhaps we may state here a hidden attack on the interpretation of σκεῦος by the Valentinians, for which cf. Förster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, 88); moreover, it is frequently found in *adv. Valent.*, e. g. 24 (201, 14). — **nec . . . homo**: cf. the note on 35, 6. — **et alia persona**: not as *servus et minor amicus*, who are *animalia nomina*. For the conception of *persona* in Tert.'s works (which in *De anima* has no particular importance, only *ex-a* 17, 12. 57, 11; *sub-is* 57, 5), cf. Roberts, 30/1; Stier, 72/8; T. B. Strong, *Journ. Theol. Stud.* 3 (1902), 292 *seqq.*; Tixeront, *Hist. des Dogmes*, 1, 402/3; Schlossmann, *Persona*, etc. (cf. comm. on 17, 12), 118 *seqq.* — **suppellex** may be a translation of σκεῦος (cf. the note on § 2); similarly, Chalcid. *translat.* 17: *corporea . . . suppellex*. A slightly different conception is found in *res.* 16 (47, 7/9): *ita et ministerium* (sc. *caro*; *min.* is excised by Kroym.) *tenebitur iudicio, ut de suo nihil sapiat, quia portio est eius, quae sapit, non suppellex*. — **sine carne**: for the ellipsis, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 145. — **vinulentiae** (A) should be retained, cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 466. Other enumerations of sins occur in *adv. Marc.* 4, 9 (441, 28 *seqq.*); *bapt.* 4, 5; *idol.* 11; *pud.* 19 (262, 23, ∞ Apoc. 21; 265, 23/4); in *idol.* 1 Tert. mentions as *species idololatrias*: *homicidium, adulterium, stuprum, fraus, concupiscentia saeculi, iniustitia, vanitas, and mendacium*. — **non* sensibus, sed effectibus**: similarly, *pat.* 6 (10, 9/10): *ad fidei non temptationem dixerim, sed typicam contestationem*. Cf. e. g. Cic. *pro M. Tullio* 55: *haec est illorum . . . extrema non oratio neque defensio, sed coniectura et quasi divinatio*; Sen. *ep.* 57, 6: *quandam non quidem perturbationem, sed mutationem*.

4. For this discussion on sinfulness, cf. 58, 6; *res.* 15 (44, 22; both times in connection with Matth. 5, 25; cf. the note on 15, 4); Hauschild, 39. 49; Ludwig, 43. — **perinde**, viz. 'atque in operatione peccatorum'. — **bona documenta** = *documenta bonitatis*; cf. e. g. Tac. *ann.* 16, 35, 1: *constantibus exemplis* = *exemplis constantiae*. More instances from Tert.'s works are given by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 34/6. — **subscribas**, i. e. *des, concedas*, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 139; Thierry, 177 (a law term, like many other words in this paragraph). — **adpingas**, i. e. *adnumeres*

(this sense is found nowhere else, cf. Thes. I. L. II: 288, 69). — *convenitur*, i. e. *incredatur* (see the note on 15, 4). — *oneretur* = *accusetur*, a meaning frequently found in Tert.'s works; cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.*, N. S. 56 (1928), 197. — *officia*: 'servants', cf. 37, 1. — *pulsantur* = *accusantur*, cf. Heumann-Seckel s. v.; Kalb, *Roms Jur.*, 128; Waltz., *Ét.*, 185.

41. *Evil in the soul.*

"The evil which proceeds from original sin and which should be distinguished from the evil caused by the operations of the devil, has become second nature to the soul; by its side the original good lives on (§ 1). It may be obscured, because it is not God himself, but it cannot be completely destroyed, as it has proceeded from Him (§ 2). So in all men both powers are present; hence all human souls, in spite of their diversity, form one genus. This original good sometimes expresses itself in prophecies and in attestations of God's omnipotence (§ 3). In baptism, the second birth, the 'curtain' of corruption caused by original sin is torn away, so that the soul beholds its own light, after which the Holy Spirit takes it under its protection, just as at birth it was caught by the evil spirit. When on this occasion the soul is wedded to the Holy Spirit, the flesh follows it as a slave forming part of the dowry (§ 4)".

The main subject of this chapter is a repetition of the thesis of *De testimonio animae*: the soul is *naturaliter Christiana* and preserves its original goodness under any circumstances; by baptism the corruption caused by original sin is destroyed. The description of baptism is based on earlier discussions of the same subject in *De baptismo* and *De paenitentia* (cf. the comm. on § 4); the only new elements are the conception of a marriage between the soul and the Holy Spirit, and the stress laid on the responsibility of the soul because of its possessing a *semen boni*. See also the discussion on this chapter by Esser, 166/76, in particular 168/9.

1. *praeter . . . superstruitur*: *praeter quod* = *praeter id quod* (not = *praeterquam quod*, as is frequently found in late Latin (Hofm., *Synt.*, 516); from Tert.'s works cf. v. v. 2). The sinfulness caused by the devil in the life of every individual (discussed in ch. 39) is clearly distinguished from the state of corruptedness proceeding from original sin. Here Tert. means the *pristina corruptio* which is washed away by baptism (40, 1: *tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur*). — *obventu*: á. λ. For the use of *obvenire* in Tert.'s works, cf. Borleffs, *Mnemos.* N. S. 60 (1932), 76. — *superstruitur*: cf. 11, 5: *nam et malus spiritus accidens res est*; 16, 7: *ne timeas et illi* (sc. diabolo) *proprietaem naturae alterius adscribere posterioris et adulterae, quem legis avenarum superseminatorem* (similarly, *praescr.* 31, 3/6). *superstruere* (from Quint. downwards) is frequently found in Tert.'s works (e. g. 55, 1; *paen.* 3, 13; 6, 10; *pud.* 6 (229, 2); *orat.* 10 = 187, 14), as compounds with *super* in general are (see the note on 18, 2). —

ex originis vitio is not yet equivalent to *ex peccato originali*, for in *origo* (just as in *primordium*, cf. the note on 9, 7) the meaning 'primordial time' is still strongly felt by Tert. For further particulars concerning original sin, see the comm. on 40, 1. — *antecedit*: 'precedes', 'forms the foundation' (cf. the notes on 20, 4 *praesunt* and 43, 7 *praeit*); hence it is given to everybody at birth. — *naturale quodammodo* repeats (*ut diximus*) 16, 1. In the former passage (as is often the case) Tert.'s formulation is more tentative and reserved: there he writes *ad instar iam naturalitatis*, here the *naturae corruptio* is qualified without reserve as *alia natura*. — *habens . . . patrem*: cf. 16, 7.

2. *obumbratur*: cf. the note on 39, 1. — *Potest . . . quia a deo est*: a similar thought occurs in Aug. *de trin.* 14, 4, 6: *quamquam enim magna natura* (sc. animae) *sit, tamen vitiari potuit, quia summa non est; et quamquam vitiari potuerit, quia summa non est, tamen, quia summae naturae capax est, et esse particeps potest, magna natura est.* The comparison of the soul to a light (viz. a fiery substance) may mean more to Tert. than a simple metaphor, for according to him, the soul is *vapor spiritus* (27, 7). — *tanta* is either almost equivalent to *maxima* (cf. the note on 33, 5: *nec tamen tanta est rogi cura*) or we have to supply: 'so great < that it can reach that level>'. — *a malo*: cf. the note on 2, 5: *a philosophia*.

3. *unum . . . genus*: cf. 20, 6: (substantiae) *quam deus in Adam contulit et matricem omnium fecit*. — *et in optimis nonnihil pessimi*: we are not entitled to consider *pessimi* as equivalent to *mali* because of the preceding *boni*. Beside the account taken of the clausula (II, with *mali* the rare form V), we have also to reckon with Tert.'s pessimism (cf. Lortz, 2, 76. 93). Perhaps Tert. copies a proverbial phrase, cf. e. g. Varro *Lex Maenia VIII* (*Sat. Menipp.* frag. 241 Bücheler): *neque in bona segete nullum est spicum nequam, neque in mala non aliquod bonum*. — *Solus . . . peccato*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 6 (341, 26 seqq.): *nam bonus natura deus solus . . . homo autem . . . non natura in bonum dispositus est, sed institutione*. — *solus . . . Christus*: cf. 55, 2. — *in praesagia erumpit*: cf. 53, 5/6; *test. an.* 5 (141, 3); Lortz, 1, 240⁵². — *priore*: for the reading *proprio* (Bmg), cf. comm. on 38, 6. — *conscientia . . . prodit*, etc. repeats the chief subject of the treatise *De testimonio animae*, especially 2, 2: '*Deus bonus*', '*Deus benefacit*' *tua vox est*; earlier already in *apol.* 17, 5/6: '*Deus magnus*', '*Deus bonus*' et '*Quod Deus dederit*' *omnium vox est. Iudicem quoque contestatur illum* '*Deus videt*' et '*Deo commendo*' et '*Deus mihi reddet*'; moreover, it is mentioned in two treatises which are almost contemporary with *de an.*, viz. *res.* (3 = 29, 3/4): *utar et reliquis communibus sensibus qui deum iudicem praedicant*: '*deus videt*' et '*deo commendo*' and *adv. Marc.* (1, 10 = 303, 8/11); cf. also *cor.* 6; *c. Chr.* 12; *ad Scap.* 2: *nos unum deum colimus, quem omnes naturaliter nostis*. We find here the (originally Stoic) conception of the natural knowledge of God by means of the *sensus communes*; a knowledge *a priori* is altogether out of the question (cf. Lortz, *Vernunft*, 139). This idea fits in very

well with the view that the original good lives on in the soul (in *De testimonio animae* this relation was not yet fully elaborated). From the copious literature on the *testimonium animae* we may adduce as the most important: Freppel, 1, 156/75; L. Fütcher, *Die natürliche Gotteserkenntnis bei Tertullian* (Zeitschr. f. kathol. Theol. 51 (1927), 1/34. 217/51); E. F. Schulze, Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 43 (1900), 84 seqq.; Lortz, 1, 234/48; 2, 145/8; Scholte, I/XI; E. Bickel in: *Pisciculi . . . F. J. Dölger dargeboten* (Münster i. W. 1939), 54/61; d'Alès, 39/40. In Min. Fel. 18, 11 (imitated by [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 9 = 26, 18 seqq. H.) we find this conception in a slightly varied form; he regards pronouncements such as '*deus dederit*' as utterances of the *vulgus*, not of the *anima omnium* (of course we are not entitled to conclude from this with Waltz., *Ét.*, 219 that Tert. follows Minucius; with the same right we might say that Minucius did not understand the gist of Tert.'s theory). This conception lives on in Latin apologetics, e. g. Arnob. 2, 3: (*deus quem esse omnes naturaliter scimus, sive cum exclamamus 'o deus' sive cum illum testem deum constituimus improborum*; Lactant. *div. instit.* 2, 1, 7 (certainly after the example of Min. Fel.); Hier. in Ps. 95; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, append. 2, 3 (p. 420 Souter). For the relation between Tert. and Min. Fel., cf. Axelsson, 104.

4. *cum . . . pervenit*: "when it attains to faith"; since this precedes baptism, baptism is the 'seal of faith': *paen.* 6, 16: *lavacrum illud obsignatio est fidei* (cf. *ib.* § 17: *non ideo abluimur* (i. e. baptizamur), *ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desimimus, quoniam iam corde loti sumus*; *praescr.* 36, 20: *eam* (sc. fidem) *aqua signat* (sc. ecclesia Romana); Dölger, *Sphragis*, 103; Windisch, *Busse*, 417). For this expression, cf. [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 17: *anima . . . cum venerit ad fidem dei*; Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Genes.* 10, 4. — *reformata . . . virtute*: similarly, *bapt.* 3, 1: *aqua reformari*; cf. *ib.* 5, 7: *ita restituitur homo deo ad similitudinem eius, qui retro ad imaginem dei fuerat*; *ib.* 8, 1 and *an.* 40, 1. The nature of this transformation is described most clearly in *bapt.* 5, 7: *recipit enim dei spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu eius acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum*. For the estimation of baptism as a regeneration, cf. especially Anrich, *Myster.*, 53₂, for the designation '*secunda nativitas*', *exh. cast.* 5, 24. The *aulaeum corruptionis* should be associated with 39, 1: *quae omnia . . . depravat*: in the same way as the devil still 'obscures the natural faculties of the soul', he did so *in primordio* (cf. *nunc quoque*); consequently, original sin 'obscures' the primary good nature of the soul, its *tota lux*; the 'curtain' of this 'obscuration' is torn away by baptism. In ch. 39/41 four consequences of baptism are mentioned, viz. liberation from the power of the devil, regeneration, illumination, marriage of the soul to the Holy Spirit. To this we may compare *adv. Marc.* 1, 28 (329, 29 seqq.), where also four consequences are mentioned: *remissio delictorum* — *absolutio mortis* — *regeneratio hominis* — *consecutio spiritus sancti*. Of these the regeneration and the acquisition of the Holy Spirit are found in both passages; the other two which are mentioned here are due to the exposition given in ch. 39. — *detracto . . . aulaeo*: when the performance in the theatre

started, the curtain was lowered (Cic. *pro Cael.* 65; Verg. *Georg.* 3, 25; Hor. *ep.* 2, 1, 189; Ovid *met.* 3, 111; in the fourth century it was raised: Amm. Marc. 16, 6, 3; 28, 6, 29; see Thes. 1. L. II: 1461, 8/11). For the metaphor, cf. 53, 6: (anima) *de oppanso corporis erumpit in apertum* (viz. at the moment of death). — **totam . . . conspiciit**: this sentence is based on the estimation of baptism as a φωτισμός or a liberation from the *pristina caecitas* (*bapt.* 1, 1; cf. Dölger ACh 2 (1930), 222 *seqq.*), which conception is probably found for the first time in Eph. 5, 8/9 (cf. Dibelius' note; the word φωτισθέντας in Hebr. 6, 4 requires a different interpretation). It is very common from Justin *apol.* 1, 61 (where the formulation καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμός shows that Justin already knew this conception as a widely-spread one; cf. Puech, *Apol. Gr.*, 140) and *dial. c. Tryph.* 39, 2 downwards. The development of this idea has not yet been traced satisfactorily; the most important data may be gathered from Wetter, ΦΩΣ; Dölger, *Sol Salutis*², 364 *seqq.*; Anrich, 125/6; Achelis, 1, 123₉; Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Mystr.*, 264 and 292; Archambault's note on Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 7, 3; Kattenbusch, art. 'Taufe' in Herzog-Hauck, *Realenz.*³, 19, 403/4; Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion*, 170 *seq.*; Kroll, *Hermes Trismeg.*, 375/6. From Tert. cf. *res.* 8 (37, 2/3): *caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu inluminetur*; *paen.* 2, 4. — **Excipitur . . . a spiritu sancto**: Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 20₁) is certainly right in regarding the omission of *a* in *Α* as a clerical error (in Cypr. *de hab. virg.* 23 (204, 6 H.): *innovati spiritu sancto a sordibus purgantur* this omission is due to the subsequent *a*, cf. Merkx, 55. *A* is frequently omitted in the Vulgate, because (Merkx, *loc. cit.*) "die Personifizierung des Begriffes *Spiritus sanctus* noch nicht den Endpunkt erreicht, und es sich noch nicht völlig vom Abstrakten losgelöst hatte"). In the present passage *a* is guaranteed by parallelism (*a spiritu profano*) and by the strongly personal conception of the Holy Spirit. — **sicut . . . profano**: as was described in 39, 1. — **animam nubentem spiritui**: the idea of a marriage between the soul and the Holy Spirit at baptism should be associated with various kindred conceptions to some of which Harnack has drawn attention (*Dogmengesch.*, 1⁵, 613₃). In the first place he mentions the idea ('griechisch-philosophisch') that the divine spirit is the bridegroom and husband of the human soul: Sap. Salom. 8, 2: ταύτην (viz. τὴν σοφίαν!) ἐφίλησα καὶ ἐξεζήτησα ἐκ νεότητός μου καὶ ἐζήτησα νόμφην ἀγαγέσθαι ἐμαυτῷ καὶ ἐραστὴς ἐγενόμην τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῆς; *Exc. ex Theodoto* 27, 5: τὴν γοῦν ἀγγελικὴν διδασκαλίαν ὑπερβᾶσα (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ διδασκόμενον ἐγγράφως ἐπὶ τὴν γνῶσιν καὶ κατάληψιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔρχεται, οὐκέτι νόμφη, ἀλλ' ἤδη λόγος γενόμενος καὶ παρὰ τῷ νυμφίῳ καταλύων μετὰ τῶν πρωτοκλήτων καὶ πρωτοκτίστων; Tatian. *orat. ad Graec.* 13: συζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένην (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος οὐκ ἔστιν ἀβοήθητος; *ib.* 15: τὴν κατὰ θεὸν συζυγίαν. Cf. also Iren. 1, 1, 11 Harvey (on the Valentinians): τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν ἐκπεπέμφθαι, ὅπως ἐνθάδε τῷ ψυχικῷ συζυγὲν μορφωθῇ. To this Harnack adds the 'apostolic conception' that the Church is the bride and the body of Christ, which idea sometimes develops

into the conception that mankind (= the Church) belongs to Christ as his 'Eve': 2 Clem. 14; Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 5, 1; Tert. *mon.* 11. As a combination of the two ideas he regards the conception that Christ is the bridegroom, and the human soul (or the human body) the bride, e. g. Novat. *de trin.* 13: *si de caelo descendit verbum hoc tamquam sponsus ad carnem*. The image of the marriage of the soul to the Holy Spirit at baptism does not seem to occur before Tert. (nothing similar is mentioned by Harnack, who omits to adduce the present passage; still it is possible that an allusion to it is found in Tatian. *orat.* 13). Anyhow, a very similar idea is found in *res.* 63 (123, 30 *seqq.*): *resurget igitur caro, et quidem omnis, et quidem ipsa, et quidem integra. in deposito est ubicumque apud deum per fidelissimum sequestrem dei et hominum Iesum Christum, qui et homini deum et hominem deo reddet, carni spiritum et spiritui carnem. utrumque iam in semetipso foederavit, sponsam sponso et sponsum sponsae comparavit. nam et si animam quis contenderit sponsam, vel dotis nomine sequetur animam caro. non erit anima prostituta, ut nuda suscipiatur a sponso* (sc. a spiritu sancto). *habet instrumentum, habet cultum, habet mancipium suum carnem*. "Christ, the *deus et homo* (cf. 55, 2), in himself united Spirit and flesh, which are related to each other as the bridegroom is to the bride". Here it occurred to Tert. that in a former (viz. this) passage he had called the soul 'the bride of the Holy Spirit'; but the flesh is so closely connected with the soul that it may at least be qualified as 'the slave of the bride' (in *de resurr.* the flesh should not be underrated too much). In Origen's works both conceptions occur: a) *homil. in Gen.* 10, 4: *sicut Christus animae vir dicitur, cui nubit anima, cum venit ad fidem* (cf. *ib.* § 5); *homil. in Exod.* 8, 4. The λόγος as the bridegroom: *homil. in cantic. cantic.* 4 (223, 21/5 Baehr.); in *Matth. tom.* 17, 21 (643, 17 *seqq.* Klost.); *ib.* 17, 31 (p. 674): the soul as the bride, at first of the law in its literal sense, afterwards of the πνευματικὸς νόμος; in *Matth. caten. frag.* 177 (G C S Orig. XII 1, p. 85); *ib. frag.* 430 (p. 179; on Matth. 22, 1/14): Γάμους ὁ πατὴρ ποιεῖ, τὴν εὐφροσύνην τῇ ἀποκαταστάσει τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς Χριστὸν καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν κοινωνίαν λόγου καὶ νύμφης ψυχῆς λαμβανούσης καὶ γεννώσης λογικὰ γεννήματα; Π. εὐχῆς 17, 2. Cf. also A. Lieske, *Die Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes* (Münster i. W. 1938), 25₂; 52₉₉; 63/4; — b) *homil. in Gen.* 1, 15; *ib.* 6, 3: *oportet ergo mori prius legem litterae, ut ita demum libera iam anima spiritui nubat et novi testamenti matrimonium sortiatur*. In the exegesis of Matth. 22, 2/14 both conceptions occur, e. g. [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 35: *indumenta nuptialia, quod est gratia baptismi*; Caesar. Arelat. *serm.* 155, 4; 179, 1. 3; 203, 4 Morin; [Theophil.] *comm. in evang.* I (p. 290 Otto): *Dominus Iesus venit hic ad nuptias, ut animam nostram spiritui maritaret*; Rufin.-Gregor. Nazianz. *orat.* 2, 14, 3: *quia . . . paranymphum prae- parantem domino populum substantivum et provocantem per aquam ad testimonium spiritus prosequitur sponsus*; Prud. *psychom. praef.* 64/5: *animam . . . spiritus complexibus pie maritam*. — *Sequitur . . . caro*: cf. the passage just quoted from *res.* 63, and Hippolyt., *comm. in*

cant. cantic. (353, 1/3 Bonwetsch): "Nimm an die Seele, verbinde (sie) mit dem Geist, damit sich auch der Leib zu mischen vermöge!" — **dotalē mancipium** "a slave belonging to the dowry" (*res.* 63: *dotis nomine sequetur animam caro*). Once more a law term, cf. e. g. *Nerat. dig.* 25, 1, 15: *cibaria dotalibus mancipiis data*; *Scaevola ib.* 41, 9, 3; *cod. Justin.* 5, 12, 3; 7, 8, 1. The same metaphorical use is found in *Martian. Cap.* 113, where *Mercurius* offers the *artes liberales* to his bride *Philologia*: *nam iam multa asserit circuisse mancipiaque dotalia quid sollertiae . . . sumerent comperisse*; cf. also *ib.* 146 and the note on 2, 1 about *dotare*. — **et iam . . . spiritus**, because the Holy Spirit takes upon itself the rights of the soul, for at baptism *suffectura est quodammodo spiritus animae* (*adv. Marc.* 1, 28 = 330, 8/9). We find another parallel in *Origen (de princ.* 3, 6, 6): *ita etiam de corporis statu putandum est quod idem ipsum corpus, quod nunc pro ministerio animae nuncupatum est animale, per profectum quendam, cum anima adiuncta deo unus cum eo spiritus fuerit effecta, iam tum corpus quod si spiritui ministrans in statum qualitatemque proficiat spiritalem, maxime cum, sicut saepe ostendimus, talis a conditore facta sit natura corporea, ut in quamcumque voluerit vel res poposcerit qualitatem facile subsequatur*. We may also compare the discussion in *Iren.* 5, 9, 1/2, which culminates in the sentence: *ubi autem spiritus Patris, ibi homo vivens . . . caro a Spiritu possessa* (for the interpretation of this passage, cf. *K. Prümm in: Pisciculi . . . Fr. J. Dölger . . . dargeboten* (Münster i. W. 1939), 217). — **si non admiserit adulterium**, viz. by relapsing into sin: for then the soul becomes unfaithful to the Holy Spirit, and comes again under the power of the *spiritus immundus*. Thus in [*Clem.*] *recogn.* 9, 3 the devil is called *adulter* because he draws the soul away from Christ, the *verus sponsus*; similarly, *Orig. in Matth. caten. frag.* 274 (GCS *Orig.* XII 1, p. 123; on *Matth.* 12, 39): *Μοιχαλὶς ἐστὶν ἡ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν ἄνδρα τὸν λόγον καταλιποῦσα καὶ τῷ παρὰ φύσιν ἄνδρι κολληθεῖσα τῷ ἐναντίῳ ἢ ὁ ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν νόμος ἀντιστρατευόμενος τῷ νόμῳ*, etc. The estimation of the apostasy from God as adultery is a Jewish conception (*Hos.* 1/3; *Ezech.* 16; *Isai.* 57, 3 *seqq.*); cf. *A. Seeberg, Die beiden Wege und das Aposteldekret*, 56 *seqq.*; *Dibelius' note on Herm. Mand.* 4, 1, 9 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 507); *Windisch's note on Jac.* 4, 4 (*ib.* 15, p. 27); *Lietzmann ad 2 Cor.* 11, 2 (*ib.* 9, p. 145); *Harnack, Marcion*, 26*. In *Tert.'s* works this metaphor is frequently found, e. g. *idol.* 1 (30, 13): *qui falsis deis servit, sine dubio adulter est veritatis*; *praescr.* 44, 5/7. Cf. also *Aug. serm.* 94, 7 *Mai* (339, 2/4 *Morin*): *amicitia quae est huius mundi adulterat animas, et fornicare facit ab uno et vero et legitimo coniuge, a quo anulum sancti spiritus accepistis*; *Synod. Illiberit.*, can. 15 (16 *Lauchert*): *propter copiam puellarum gentilibus minime in matrimonium dandae sunt virgines Christianae, ne aetas in flore tumens in adulterium animae resolvatur*; *Optat. Milev.* 4, 6 (heretics regarded as *moechi*); *Pelag. ad Rom.* 2, 22: *non est una moechia: nam omne quod totum deo debet anima, si alicui praeter deum reddideris, moecharis*. Perhaps the expression *renuntiare diabolo* (for which cf. the note on 35, 3) may also be mentioned in this connection, for *renuntiare* is

frequently equivalent to *repudium ducere* (see J. Köhne, *Tert.'s Schrift "Ueber die Schauspiele"*, 22).

42. This chapter opens the discussion on *death* (ch. 42/53) which, however, is immediately interrupted by a lengthy digression on sleep and dream (ch. 43/9); so this chapter is no more than a general introduction. Tert. begins by attacking the second *χόρις δόξα* of Epicurus and asserts that death 'does pertain to us'; after this a phrase coined by Seneca is equally refuted. Tert. may perhaps owe the knowledge of the *χόρις δόξα* to Soranus (however, cf. the comm.), whereas he knows the quotation from Seneca through reading this author. Since the two refutations are very similar, and the second cannot possibly have been taken from Soranus, it may be supposed that in the first case Tert. does not owe anything to this author either.

1. *superest*, viz. *dicere* (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 146) or *dicam* (cf. 43, 5). For the ellipsis of *verba dicendi* in Tert.'s works, cf. the comm. on ch. 4; Löfst., *Apol.*, 83 and *Synt.*, 2, 246₁. — *ponat*: Reifferscheid's conjecture *ponatur* is superfluous (cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 22). The intransitive use of *ponere* occurs in Verg. *Aen.* 7, 27: *cum venti posuere* (similarly, *ib.* 10, 103; Ovid *her.* 7, 49; Stat. *silv.* 2, 2, 118; *Theb.* 5, 13; Gell. 2, 30, 2; Sidon. *Apollin. ep.* 2, 2, 16; Paneg. 7, 12, 8); Prop. 3, 10, 6; Theodor. Priscian. *eupor.* 9: *sic agitatū oleum facies ponere*. — *consummat*: 'reaches its terminus'. This verb frequently occurs in Latin of the later period in combination with a gerund or a part., e. g. in *It. (Lugd.) Gen.* 43, 2: *cum consummassent edentes* (cf. Thes. l. L. IV: 604, 11/20); when used absolutely, it mostly means 'to die', e. g. *Iren. lat.* 3, 4, 2: *Cerdon . . . sic consummavit* (οὕτως διετέλεσε); *Vict. Vit.* 3, 27: *feliciter . . . consummans martyrialem coronam accepit*. Cf. also Hippocr. *aer.* 19: *sol . . . consummans* (τελευτῶν); [*Cypr.] de pasch. comput.* 4 (251, 14/5 H.): *eundem mensem . . . incipere et . . . consummare*; *ib.* 19 (266, 17). — For *quamquam* followed by a subjunctive, see the note on 38, 1. — The meaning of *vulgari* is explained by *res.* 1 (25, 13/4): *plane cum vulgo interdum et sapientes sententiam suam iungunt. nihil esse post mortem Epicuri schola est*. Cf. also *ib.* 57 (116, 8); *adv. Marc.* 1, 13 (307, 15/6). — *Quod . . . nos*: *Epic. χόρ. δόξ.* 2 (Usen., *Epic.*, 71): 'Ο θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ· τὸ δ' ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Cic. (*fin.* 2, 31, 100) translates: *mortem nihil ad nos pertinere; quod enim dissolutum sit, id esse sine sensu; quod autem sine sensu sit, id nihil ad nos pertinere omnino*. Once more Tert.'s exactness in rendering a Greek text should be noted (cf. the comm. on 18, 1 and 28, 1): it is Cic., but not Tert., who adds *pertinere*. Since this sentence is frequently quoted (cf. Usen., *Epic.*, 395), it is not absolutely necessary to assume that Tert. took it from Soranus. — *Dissolvitur . . . patitur*: of course this sophistic refutation bears upon the form of the *δόξα* only, for by τὸ διαλυθὲν Epicurus certainly did not mean death (cf. Franck, 21). For an allusion to *χόρ. δόξ.* 1 in *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 15/6; from *Iren.*), see Quispel, 27. — *dissolutricem*: the only other instance of this word is found in *Cod.*

Justin. 5, 17, 8, 3: (feminam) *sepulchrorum* (al.: -*torum*) -*cem.* — *peremptricem*: see for this word, Mohrm., *Aug.*, 216. — *ineptum, ut*: this expression also occurs in *praescr.* 29, 13; *Cypr. ep.* 74, 5, 4, and 75, 20, 1; see Löfstedt, *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 58. To the present passage we may compare Lactantius' refutation (*div. instit.* 3, 17, 30/1): '*Quando nos sumus, mors non est; quando mors est, nos non sumus; mors ergo nihil ad nos*' (*Epic. ep.* 3, p. 61, 6 Usen.) *Quam argute nos jefellit! quasi vero transacta mors timeatur, qua iam sensus ereptus est, ac non ipsum mori, quo sensus eripitur* (cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 294/5).

2. *coactius* either means 'more succinctly' or *violentius*; the latter meaning occurs fairly often in Tert.'s works, e. g. *bapt.* 12, 6; *praescr.* 7, 20; for further particulars, see Thes. I. L. III: 1533, 70 *seqq.* — *post mortem . . . etiam ipsa*: Sen. *de immatura morte* frag. 28 Haase. Cf. *res.* 1 (25, 14/5): *Ait et Seneca omnia post mortem finire, etiam ipsam; ib.* 3 (29, 5/6). Cf. Sen. *Troad.* 397: *post mortem nihil est, ipsaque mors nihil* (see Usen., *Epic.*, p. 395); *Consol. ad Marc.* 19,5: *quod vero ipsum nihil est et omnia in nihilum redigit.* — *inter omnia*: Hartel's conjecture *interim* perverts the sense of the passage. The meaning is: 'man is 'finished' by death like all other beings'; a striking parallel is furnished by *adv. Marc.* 5, 7 (595, 9/12): *adeo omnium deum creatorem facit, a quo et mundus et vita et mors . . . ab eo igitur inter omnia (= sicut et alia omnia) et Christus.* Only by interpreting the sentence in this way do we understand the line of the argument: A. (Sen.) '*Post mortem omnia finiuntur, etiam ipsa*'. B. *Si mors et ipsa finitur, ad semetipsam pertinebit.* <*Si omnia finientur, mors ad omnia pertinebit: sed inter omnia et homo est*>. C. *Ergo mors ad hominem pertinet.* For this use of *inter omnia . . . et*, cf. the note on 46, 11: *inter cetera . . . quoque.* To this sentence we may especially compare Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 1114/7: *omnis pariter deos / perdet mors aliqua et chaos / et mors fata novissima / in se constituet sibi.* — *Si enim . . . extra nos*: cf. the argument in 27, 2.

3. *postuma*: see the note on 17, 12. — *de alia provincia animae*: for *in morte anima consummat* (§ 1). — *speculum eius somnus*: this is repeated in 50, 1 (where Tert. proceeds to discuss death after the digression on sleep and dream; the use of the same words serves to connect the two passages, cf. the note on 25, 1) and in 58, 3; cf. 43, 10: *imaginem mortis* and *res.* 18 (50, 13/4): *ita nec in veritate mortis cadit* (sc. anima), *quae nec in imagine eius ruit.* This metaphor is frequently found, e. g. Hom. *Il.* 14, 231, etc.; Hesiod. *theog.* 756; Orph. *hymn.* 85, 8; Plato *apol.* 40 C; Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 38, 72; Lucr. 3, 919 *seqq.*; Sen. *Herc. fur.* 1069; [Plut.] *consol. ad Apollon.* 12; *Anthol. Lat.* 716, 19; Prud. *cathem.* 1, 25/6. — *nec . . . aliena materia est*: hence *a fortiori* death 'does pertain to us'.

43. *Sleep.*

"Sleep is undoubtedly not unnatural, as was assumed by some philosophers (§ 1). [Here follows a survey of their views on this subject together with a refutation, §§ 2/4]. The only possible opinion is that of the Stoics, who contend that the activity of the soul is not abolished when the body is sleeping (§ 5). Whoever questions the idea that sleep is natural, may be referred to the dialecticians; but we Christians can give him a plain answer, because our starting-point is the contemplation of God (§ 6). We consider nature as a rational work of God, and sleep as salutary and rational; so sleep is natural (§ 7). The physicians also support this view, because they regard everything that is harmful to sleep as unnatural; in calling lethargy unnatural, they admit that in its normal state sleep is natural (§ 8). Further proof is furnished by the contemplation of primeval times: Adam slept before he ate and drank, which proves that sleep is at least as natural as eating and drinking which are regarded by everybody as natural practices (§ 9). For the rest, the sleep of Adam was the prototype of the death of Christ (§ 10), and in general sleep is the image of death (§ 11). Similarly, the activity of the soul during sleep is an image of its survival after death, and its reanimating of the body after sleep a symbol of resurrection (§ 12)".

This chapter consists of two parts. It begins with a discussion on doxographical matter, in which Tert. sides with the Stoics (§§ 1/8; here he undoubtedly follows Soranus, who regarded sleep as natural, cf. Cael. Aurel. *morb. acut.* 2, 9, 45: *somnus autem naturale est officium*; *ib.* 1, *prae*f. 17 the *pressura* is definitely kept apart from sleep on account of its being *contra naturam*; cf. also *morb. chron.* 5, 11, 137 and Karpp, 46). This part, which contains numerous particulars borrowed from medical literature, is followed by a purely 'Christian' exposition, in which the naturalness of sleep is demonstrated by a more general speculation and a consideration of the *forma primordii* (see the note on 9,7); this leads to a discussion on the significance of sleep as a symbol of death and resurrection (§§ 10/2). For this second part no particular sources seem to have been consulted.

1. *extranaturale*: this adj. occurs in Tert.'s works only; for the use of the neuter gender, cf. the note on 27, 9. — *his* = *talibus*, see the comm. on 31, 3. *haberi videantur*: this circumstantiality is primarily due to the *clausula*.

2. *Stoici*: this definition was copied from such a passage as Aët. 5, 24, 4 (*St. V. F.* 2, 767, = [Galen] *hist. philos.* 128, *D D G* 646, 15/7): Πλάτων οἱ Στωικοὶ τὸν μὲν ὕπνον γίνεσθαι ἀνέσει τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ πνεύματος or Diog. Laërt. 7, 158 (*St. V. F.* 2, 766): τὸν δὲ ὕπνον γίνεσθαι ἐκλυομένου τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ τόνου (cf. *vigoris*) περὶ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. Cf. also Cic. *divin.* 2, 119 (*St. V. F.* 1, 130): *contrahi autem animum Zeno et quasi labi putat atque concidere et <id> ipsum esse*

dormire. vigor (omitted in the *index Latinus* in *St. V. F.* IV) may be a translation of *τόνος* as in 48, 1: *quasi iam emergente animarum vigore prodactio sopore*. — **Epicurei**: Usener (frag. 325) only quotes the present passage; cf. also Diog. Laërt. 10, 66: ὕπνον τε γίνεσθαι τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρων τῶν παρ' ὅλην τὴν σύγκρισιν παρεσπαρμένων ἐγκατεχομένων ἢ διαφορουμένων, εἴτα συμπιπτόντων τοῖς ἐσπαρμένοις. Lucretius (4, 907/61) assumes sleep to be caused by the fact that the atoms constituting the soul are partly driven from the body and partly retreat into its inner parts (945) or are distributed over different parts of the body (946/7). At any rate, *deminutio* has a definitely concrete sense in the present passage. For the estimation of sleep as a proof of the mortality of the soul, cf. Philodem. *Περὶ θεῶν ἀγωγῆς Volum. Herculan.*¹ VI col. 12 and Heinze, *Lucr. III*, p. 136. — **Anaxagoras**: Aët. 5, 25, 2 (A 103 Diels): 'Α. κατὰ κόπον τῆς σωματικῆς ἐνεργείας γίνεσθαι τὸν ὕπνον· σωματικὸν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πάθος, οὐ ψυχικόν. — **Xenophane**: Diels A 51 adduces this passage only. *defetiscentia* is Tp and may be regarded as a neologism coined by Tert. — **Empedocles**: Aët. 5, 24, 2 (A 85 Diels): 'Ε. τὸν μὲν ὕπνον καταψύξει τοῦ ἐν τῷ αἵματι θερμοῦ συμμετρώ γίνεσθαι, τῇ δὲ παντελεῖ θάνατον; ib. 5, 25, 4: ὕπνον δὲ γίνεσθαι διαχωρισμῷ τοῦ πυρώδους; cf. also Wellmann, *Frag. d. gr. Ärzte*, 1, 23. — **Parmenides**: this passage (which is not adduced by Diels, *Vors.*) seems to contain the only existing reference to his view on sleep. For the connection of the two philosophers, cf. Suidas s. v. 'Εμ.π. (A 2 *Vors.*): ἡκροάσατο δὲ πρώτου Παρμενίδου; Diog. Laërt. 8, 55 (*ib.* A 1): ὁ δὲ Θεόφραστος Παρμενίδου φησὶ ζῆλωτὴν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι; E. Howald, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 87 (whose opinion about Arius is certainly wrong). — **Strato**: no further references are known. Diog. Laërt. 5, 59 mentions his treatises *Περὶ ὕπνου* and *Περὶ ἐνυπνίων* (Susemihl, 1, 869₁₆₇). — **segregationem**: there seems to be only one other instance of this subst. (Chalcid. *comm.* 279). — **consati**: this form, which may be regarded as a neologism coined by Tert., also occurs in *res.* 16 (46, 25/6): *caro . . . ab exordio uteri consata conformata congenita animae*; *ib.* 47 (97, 7/8 = Rom. 6, 5): *si enim consati (σύμφυτοι) fuerimus simulacro mortis Christi*. In both passages *consatus* is to be regarded as a compound of *satus*; here, too, the σύμφυτον πνεῦμα is meant. As strictly equivalent to *consitus* it occurs only in Solin. 9, 18: *cum se coitu draconis consatam adfirmaret* (Olympias). A *ἀ. λ.* *consatio* is conjectured by Gothofredus (followed by Borleffs) in *ad nat.* 2, 11, 3: *Consuevius . . . qui con<satio>nibus concubitalibus praesit*; but perhaps we should do better to read *con-sitionibus*. — **Democritus**: Diels (A 136 *Vors.*) associates this passage with Aët. 5, 2, 1: Δ. τοὺς ὀνείρους γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὰς τῶν εἰδώλων παραστάσεις, which has hardly anything to do with it. We may do better to adduce Leucippus A 34 (Aët. 5, 25, 3): Δ. ὕπνον σώματος γίνεσθαι ἀποκρίσει τοῦ λεπτομεροῦς πλείονι τῆς εἰσχύσεως τοῦ ψυχικοῦ θερμοῦ and Epicurus' definition of sleep as a *deminutio spiritus animalis*, which must certainly be traced back to Democritus. — **Aristoteles**: a detailed discussion is found in Π. ὕπνου καὶ ἐγρηγόρσεως 3; of course the note copied from Soranus was more similar (though

not identical) to Aët. 5, 25, 1: 'Α. κοινὸν μὲν τὸν ὕπνον σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς. αἴτιον δ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀναθυμιαθὲν ὑγρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θώρακος εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τόπους ἐκ τῆς ὑποκειμένης τροφῆς ἣ τὸ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ καταψυχθὲν θερμόν. — **praesumo**: cf. 1, 1. In 48, 4 Tert. in the same way appeals to his own experience: *Ieiunus autem nescio an ego solus plurimum ita somniem, ut me somniasse non sentiam*. — **concepitur somnus**: as far as I know, the only existing parallel is found in *Culex* 158: *mitem concepit . . . soporem*. — **eum ex illa est, illa iam non est**: a thought which is familiar to Tert., e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 9 (346, 4/5): *intellege itaque adflatum minorem spiritu esse, ut aurulam eius, et si de spiritu accidit, non tamen spiritum*. All the same, he does not shrink from asserting the very contrary, if the context requires it (10,9): *Ipsum est enim quid, per quod est quid*.

3. **refrigescientiam**: ἄ. λ. — **et** (Gel.) is the correct reading, for if we follow Rigaltius in retaining *ut* (A), the words *per somnum* become superfluous in the subordinate clause. Tert. mentions two arguments: a) bodies get warmed by sleep, as everybody may observe; b) the digestion taking place during sleep would be harmed by cooling down. These two arguments are independent from each other. The form of the syllogism is once more confused: we should expect the words *calore . . . tardabili* to be put after *refrigeraremur*. Instead of *adeo* we might expect *magnopere*, cf. the note on 33, 5: *Nec tamen tanta est rogi cura*. — **dispensatio** occurs in a similar context in *Veget. mulom.* 2, 119, 3; *Macrobian. Somn. Scip.* 2, 16, 9; in *adv. Val.* 31 (206, 18) the sense is 'distribution', in *adv. Prax.* 2 (229, 3) and 4 (232, 7) it refers to the *oeconomia salutis*; cf. also *adv. Val.* 28 (204, 14). — **procederet**: 'would take place'; similarly, 48, 2; *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 5; *apol.* 13, 2 (for which cf. Thörnell, *Eran.* 16 (1916), 93). — **properabili . . . tardabili**: both ἄ. λ. (and certainly coined for the occasion). Of course we must not follow Gomperz in writing *-lis*, because the sense is active, as is often the case in archaic Latin, and very frequently in Latin of the later period. Cf. Kroll's note on *Catull.* 64, 115; Koffmane, 1, 54₁; *Lfst., Verm. Stud.*, 84/8; Kaulen, 139 *seqq.*; Rönsch, *It.*², 109 *seqq.*; M. Leumann, *Die lat. Adj. auf -lis* (Strassburg 1917), 95 *seqq.*; 116 *seqq.*; Sverr., *Oros.*, 57/8 and *Pallad.*, 287/8; Thörn., *Patrist.*, 21; Cooper, 98/9; Gabarrou, 42/3; Tidn., *Did.*, 160; Bendz, *Cael.*, 25 *seqq.*; Väänänen, 169. Many instances of this active use are found in *Amm. Marc.*, e. g. *adulabilis* 14, 11, 11; *celebrabilis* 29, 5, 56; *contemplabilis* 23, 4, 2; *impetrabilis* 17, 11, 3; 29, 5, 4, 32; *labilis* 27, 10, 11; *perflabilis* 16, 10, 7. — **digestio** = *concoctio* is found from *Quintil. inst.* 11, 3, 19 downwards. — **aestuantis**: cf. *res.* 4 (30, 23): *et (sc. erit) intestinis aestuandum*; *iei.* 6 (280, 7/9): *totum illud domicilium interioris hominis escis stipatum, . . . decoquendis iam stercoribus exaestuans*; *Prud. cathem.* 7, 125: *extis intus aestuantibus*. — **quod . . . operatio est**: cf. note on 15,1.

4. **minoratur**: For the sense, cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 6 (298, 7): *desinit enim (sc. summum magnum), si subiciatur*.

5. **Superest**: it is not necessary to insert *ut* (Reifferscheid), for after *superest* Tert. puts a subj. (which occurs from Plin. *ep.* downwards), e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 19, 1 and *pud.* 19 (266, 8; cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 87/8), as well as *ut* (e. g. 21, 3) or an infin. (*bapt.* 17, 1). — **si forte**: “if it is necessary to decide the question here”; cf. the note on 8, 5. — **corporis... quietem procuret**: we should expect the dat. (cf. 6, 3), which occurs in 20, 3. — **mobilem**: so § 12 (repeated in 45, 1): *probat se mobilem semper* (sc. anima). — **exercitam** occurs only here and in 45, 1 with the sense of ‘busy’, ‘occupied’ (Thes. l. L. V, 2: 1379, 5/7). — **succidere** is a positively right emendation by Latinius, cf. *apol.* 27, 6: *condicioni suae succidunt* (V; *parent et succidunt* F, which is defended by Waltz., *Comm. analyt.*, 203; *parent et succidunt* Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 71); *res.* 62 (123, 15); *cor.* 6, 16 (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 30); *adv. Val.* 10 (188, 15/6): *sed incassum enisa, ut vires deserebant, in preces succidit* (R³; *succidit* P M F R¹); the same mistake is often found, e. g. *Sen. nat. quæst.* 6, 13, 6 (cf. Axelson, *N. S. S.*, 157₃₅); see the note on 6, 5 for the promiscuous use of *accedens* and *accidens*. — **alienae . . . immortalitatis**: § 12: *nec naturam immortalitatis servam soporis addicit* (sc. anima; repeated in 45, 1); Clem. Alex. *paed.* 2, 9, 82, 1: *χρῆ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσιν εἰδέναι, ὥς οὐ ψυχῆς τὸ δεόμενον ὕπνου ἐστὶν (ἀεικίνητος γὰρ αὕτη), ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀναπαύλαις διαβασταζόμενον παρίεται*. — **corpori . . . ei soli**: in Latin of the classical period such a repetition after a relative clause (respectively after an apposition or a parenthesis) is only usual with a subject or an object (Hofm., *Synt.*, 478/9). — I regard **adulatur** (B) as the correct reading. First of all we may refer to § 11: *corpus . . . blanda quietis necessitate prostratum*. It is true that we find no other instances of *adulari* followed by an accus. of the interior object, but this is often the case with *blandiri*. Apart from adverbial accusatives as *multum* (Aug. in *Ps.* 44, 18), *nihil* (Tert. *pud.* 3 (225, 13/4); *C. I. L.* VI 1760), or *aliquid* ([Quintil.] *declam.* 14, 4; Tert. *mon.* 12; Salvian. *de gub. dei* 6, 44; Ruric. *ep.* 1, 13), there are many more places which may be compared to the present passage, e. g. Tert. *pud.* 19 (265, 11/2): (Iohannem) *illic quidem aliquid de venia blandientem* (‘blande disserentem’ Thes. l. L. II: 2031, 27/8); Hegesipp. 1, 42, 2: *successionem sibi indubiam blandiebatur*; Min. Fel. 8, 5: *ita illis pavorem fallax spes solacia rediviva blanditur* (‘blandiendo praebebat’ Lfst., *Synt.*, 1, 199₁); perhaps Aug. *civ. dei* 11, 16: *cum . . . voluptas . . . quid iucundum corporis sensibus blandiatur spectat*. Cf. also Sedul. *Op. Pasch.* 5, 27: (angelus) *terrorem projecto custodibus ignea facie comminatus, laetitiam quaerentibus Christum nivea vestis iucunditate blanditus*; Macrobi. *Sat.* 2, 5, 4: *inde blandiebatur sibi Augustus laetum in filia animum*; Venant. Fort. *carm.* 10, 1, 29: *si quaedam illi blandiatur*. Cf. the accus. after *favere* (Thes. l. L. VI: 375, 3/4); Cic. *Phil.* 2, 21: *quod quidem ego favissem tibi fateor, suasisse ne tu quidem dicis*; Venant. Fort. *carm.* 9, 15, 6: *singula silva favens; insidiari: Visio Pauli* 31 (James, *Apocr. Anecd.*, 1, 29, 6/7): *malignitatem insidiantur proximo suo; parcere*: Sulpic. Sever. *chron.* 3, 15, 5: *reliquis salutem servitio nuper exemptis parceret* (saltem Halm; *salutem* is defended by Martin, *W kl Phil.* 35 (1918), 352); for *indulgere alicui aliquid* (in Jet), cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 81, for

the use of *adulari* in Tert.'s works in general, *id.*, *Beitr.*, 89/90. The right interpretation was already given by Iunius: "adulatur, adulans tribuit, μεταληπτικῶς".

6. *dialecticos*: who are of course equally odious to Tert. (note the antithesis to *apud nos*) as to Seneca (*ep.* 45, 5/13; 48, 4/12; 49, 5/12, etc.; cf. Haase's index, p. 108); cf. also Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1, 28, 176, 3: οἱ νῦν διαλεκτικοὶ περὶ τὰ σοφιστικὰ ἀσχολούμενοι, and Aug. c. *Iulian. op. imperf.* 6, 18: *philosophaster et dialecticus*. It is not impossible that in the present passage *dialecticos* refers to Aristotle (cf. *praescr.* 7, 18/9: *Aristotelen, qui illis dialecticam instituit*), cf. *de gener. animal.* 4, 4 (770b 9 *seqq.*): ἔστι γὰρ τὸ τέρας τῶν παρὰ φύσιν τι, παρὰ φύσιν δ' οὐ πάσαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ· περὶ γὰρ τὴν αἰεὶ καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης οὐθὲν γίνεται παρὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ μὲν οὕτω γινομένοις, ἐνδεχομένοις δὲ καὶ ἄλλως, ἐπεὶ καὶ τούτων ἐν ὅσοις συμβαίνει παρὰ τὴν τάξιν μὲν ταύτην, αἰεὶ μέντοι μὴ τυχόντως, ἥττον εἶναι δοκεῖ τέρας, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ παρὰ φύσιν εἶναι τρόπον τινὰ κατὰ φύσιν, ὅταν μὴ κρατήσῃ τὴν κατὰ τὴν ὕλην ἢ κατὰ τὸ εἶδος φύσις. The contrast κατὰ φύσιν-παρὰ φύσιν being of special importance to Soranus, it may be assumed that Tert. here draws on this author (who frequently quoted Aristotle: cf. Introduction, p. 40*) for the purpose of demonstrating that sleep, even if it is *extranaturalis*, may yet be regarded as natural. For *dialecticus* as a denomination of the Stoics (which in the present passage is out of the question), see Kroll's note on Cic. *orat.* 114. — *in dubium deducentes*: see 24, 3, and for *citra* = *praeter*, the note on 20, 4; for *sortiri* followed by an infin., cf. the comm. on 8, 4. — *haberi videantur*: cf. § 1. — *et utique . . . aut nulla natura*, so that sleep is certainly not to be regarded as an exceptional case; from this fact the *sensus communis* will conclude that it is natural. — *apud nos*, sc. *Christianos*; cf. 2, 3. — *auctoris*: cf. 16, 2: *quia naturae deus auctor est*; *cor.* 5, 35: *deum, naturae dominum et auctorem*. The same argument occurs in 1, 6: *nullum . . . potius animae demonstratorem quam auctorem*.

7. *rationale opus dei*: a Stoic conception, cf. e. g. *St. V. F.* 2, 549. 937; 3, 337; Sen. *de benef.* 4, 7, 1: *quid enim aliud est natura quam deus et divina ratio . . .*? Still we should guard against exaggerating the influence of the Stoics on Tert. in this matter, as was rightly pointed out by Klein, 83/4. — *somnum ratio praeit*: similarly, 17, 10: (sensus) *quibus iam et causae libere praeiungunt*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (339, 3/4): *si legis imponendae ratio praecessit*; *ib.* 2, 5 (339, 26/7): *nec immorabor huic articulo, praeiunte definitione etiam ipsius Christi ex operibus ineundae probationis*. For a similar use of *praeesse*, cf. the note on 20, 4. — *absque* = *sine* occurs from Plautus downwards, but does not become common before the second century of our era (*Thes. l. L.* I: 185, 78 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 531). In Tert.'s works *absque* is rarely found with this meaning. In quotations from Holy Scripture (*idol.* 4 (34,1); *adv. Marc.* 1, 26 (371, 22); *adv. Prax.* 18 (260, 9. 27/8); c. *Chr.* 24, 8) it is equivalent to *praeter*. — *recreatorem* and *redintegratorem*

(also *res.* 57 (117, 7), ∞ *resuscitator*): two neologisms which are certainly due to rhyme. — **probatores**: here this word neither means: 'he who approves' (Cic. *Phil.* 2, 29; Apul. *de deo Socr.* 16 and *apol.* 16; Tert. *adv. Marc.* 4, 39 (553, 6), etc.) nor 'he who puts to the test' (e. g. Iren. lat. 3, 40, 2), but: '*qui valetudines* ('health', not 'illness'; for the plural, cf. 24, 4 ∞ 24, 9) *probas efficit*'. Thus *probare* is used in the sense of *probum efficere*; cf. the use of *privare* in 2, 2. — **aufere**... **colorem**: these words are an imitation of Verg. *Aen.* 6, 272: *rebus nox abstulit atra colorem* (for other imitations of this verse, cf. Weyman, *Christl.-Lat. Poesie*, 67). Note the use of the genit. instead of the dat. (cf. comm. on 6, 3). — Similar ἐγκώμια τοῦ ὕπνου are found in Sen. *Herc. fur.* 1072/3: *pater o rerum, portus vitae / lucis requies noctisque comes*; Philo *spec. leg.* 1, 298: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐργηγορότες εὖ πάσχομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθεύδοντες, τοῦ φιλοδώρου θεοῦ μεγάλην ἐπικουρίαν, ὕπνον, τῷ θνητῷ γένει παρασχόντος; *ib.* 2, 100/3. Perhaps we may take into account here the influence of the *Corpus Hermeticum* (cf. for this question the Introduction, p. 47*), as a very detailed description is found in *Exc.* V, 5/7 (408, 28 *seqq.* = Stob. 291, 23 *seqq.*; text as given by Wachsmuth): ἀγαθὸς ὢν ὁ δημιουργὸς . . . εἰς διαμονὴν τοῦ ζῶντος ἐποίησε τὸν ὕπνον, μέγιστον (φάρμακον μέγιστον Scott, which may be right) τοῦ καμάτου τῆς κινήσεως, καὶ ἐπ' ἰσότητος ἔταξεν ἑκατέρω χρόνον, μᾶλλον δὲ τῇ ἀναπαύλῃ πλείονα. μεγίστην δὲ νόει, τέκνον, τοῦ ὕπνου τὴν ἐνέργειαν, ἐναντίαν τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐκ ἐλάττω δ' ἐκείνης. καθάπερ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ κινήσεώς ἐστιν ἐνέργεια, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ σώματα ζῆν οὐ δύναται χωρὶς τοῦ ὕπνου· ἄνεσις γὰρ καὶ ἄφεσις ἐστὶ τῶν συνδέτων μελῶν καὶ ἔσωθεν ἐνεργεῖ σωματοποιῶν τὴν ἐπεισελθούσαν ὕλην, ἐκάστω τὸ οἰκεῖον διαστέλλων, τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ τῷ αἵματι, etc. διόπερ καὶ ἥδεται ἄκρως τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ὕπνου ταύτην ἐνεργοῦντος τὴν ἡδονήν. See also Skutsch, *ARW* 13 (1910), 297. — **nihil non naturale . . . rationale**: these words are missing in A and Gel; B has *nihil non naturale rationale quod rationale* in parentheses. Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 1, 78) has proved that these words cannot be excised completely. The points of the preceding argument are given here in reversed order. Tert. had argued: "1) *omnis natura rationalis est*; 2) *somnus rationalis est* (somnum ratio praeit), *quia vitalis, etc. est*; 3) *ergo somnus naturalis est*"; now he reverses the order: "*si somnus vitalis, etc. est, rationalis est; inde et naturalis, quia omne rationale naturale est*". Thörnell gives this interpretation of the words transmitted by B only: "*nihil rationale non naturale, quod rationale*"; on the last two words he observes: "*cum illud inculcetur, omne rationale naturale esse eo ipso, quod rationale sit*". This explanation to a certain extent makes the impression of being forced. If we stick to the reading of B (which Thörnell, too, wants to retain for the constitution of the text), a literal translation gives the following sense: "Now, if sleep is a force maintaining life, etc., nothing of this kind can be irrational, <and> nothing that is rational is unnatural, for the very reason that it is rational"; in other words, we must begin a new sentence with *nihil non naturale rationale*, and assume an asyndeton. If, on the other hand, we excise the first *rationale*, we get: *nihil eiusmodi*

non rationale, nihil non naturale, quod rationale, and can retain the *anaphora* of *nihil*, which is neutralized by Thörnell's interpretation. The correction made by Kroymann (*nihil eiusmodi non rationale, nihil non naturale, quia naturale, quod rationale*) makes a better sense than Thörnell's explanation and retains the *anaphora*; however, his insertion of *quia naturale* is unnecessary, for *quod rationale* ("<exactly> because <it is> rational") is quite satisfactory and in perfect accordance with Tert.'s usual style.

8. *naturales cardines* (A B) instead of *naturae cardines* is certainly right (cf. below the expression *testimonio naturali*). *Cardines* in the present passage is wrongly paraphrased in Thes. l. L. III: 446, 57/9 by 'fere i. q. *status, qualitas*'. Tert. retains the original meaning of the word, cf. e. g. *cult. fem.* 2, 5, 1: *de modo et cardine* ('the main point' Kok, which is wrong; we must associate this with the *certi fines* mentioned by Hor.) *et iustitia* ('normal way') *corporis excolendi*. For *aemulus* = *inimicus*, see the note on 2, 5. — *phreneticam* . . . *lethargo*: these diseases are frequently mentioned together, for instance in the so-called letter of Diocles (Jaeger, *Diokles*, p. 76, 34), the Διόκταρά of Dionysius of Aegae, ch. 19/20 (Deichgräber, *Empir.*, p. 338, 7/8), Cic. *divin.* 1, 81, Cels. 3, 18/9, Firm. *Mat. math.* 3, 5, 29, Soran. *gynaec.* 3, 1, and Theodor. Priscian. *eupor.* 2, 3, 13. It is evident that these examples were borrowed by Tert. from Soranus, who had given a very detailed description of *phrenitis* (Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb. lib. I*), and had qualified these diseases as *παρὰ φύσιν* (*gynaec.*, *loc. cit.*). — *testimonio* . . . *respondent*: Thörnell (*St. Tert.*, 2, 36) translates: "wenn sie ihn bei einem Lethargischen für nicht natürlich erklären, entsprechen sie einem Zeugnisse der Naturgemässheit (das abgegeben werden muss), wenn er innerhalb seines Maasses ist" or "wenn sie ihn bei einem Lethargischen als nicht natürlich bezeichnen, stimmen sie dadurch dem Zeugnisse der Naturgemässheit zu, etc.". The latter translation is undoubtedly to be preferred to the former; it seems, however, advisable to connect the subordinate clause *cum in suo temperamento est* more closely with *naturali* than with *testimonio*, and to translate: "they agree with a testimony (i. e. they agree to find here a testimony) of the naturalness of sleep in case it is normal". Further, I would prefer to regard *lethargus* as a designation of the disease (so already Lucr. and Hor.), for in the foregoing passage two diseases (*phrenetica* and *cardiaca*) have been mentioned (an equally ambiguous case is found in Arist. *de somno* 3 (457a 3); cf. the note in the Oxford translation). The description was certainly copied from Soranus, cf. Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 2, 1, 3: *sed neque iste* (sc. *lethargus*) *somnus est, impeditus omnibus naturalis actionis officiis, sed est oppressio quae nihil resumat aegrotantem, ac potius demergat*. — *in suo temperamento*: 'in its normal state', as *in forma* in *pall.* 2, 3, for which cf. Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 108₁. — *defraudatione*: an extremely rare word (Iren. lat. 5, 6, 1; Ennod. *opusc.* 2, 36 = 298, 21 Hartel; *defrudatio* C G L II 253, 52 and Iren. *loc. cit.*, cod. B¹). — *enormitate*: this subst. (from Sen. downwards) is frequently found in Tert.'s works, cf. Kok, 168.

— **rescinditur**: a law term (cf. the note on 53, 3). — **non naturale**: ὁφ' ἐν, cf. 2, 5.

9. **esum**: cf. comm. on 10, 6. — **de . . . sortibus**, i. e. *de illis quae natura nostra sortita est*; cf. the notes on 8, 4; 11, 6; 20, 6. — **in his**: Hartel (*Patr. Stud.* 4, 78) proposes to excise *in* and gives the following interpretation: "auch diesen bereitet der Schlaf am meisten den Weg; schlafen, essen und trinken sind natürliche Bedürfnisse, der Schlaf geht ihnen voran, wie an dem Verhalten Adams gezeigt wird: *in his* besagt das Gegenteil, dass Essen und Trinken am meisten dem Schlafe förderlich sind". On the other hand, Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 37) wants to retain *in* and translates: "Auch bei diesen hat ja der Schlaf eine bedeutende vorbereitende Wirksamkeit"; for the use of *in*, he refers to *spect.* 10 (12, 24): *et est plane in artibus quoque scaenicis Liberi et Veneris patrocinium*. In my opinion, a more natural interpretation is given by translating: "for in these things, too, there is (i. e. these things, too, are) a most important preparation for sleep", i. e. "eating and drinking cause sleepiness"; cf. e. g. *apol.* 39, 17: *ita saturantur* (sc. non immodice), *ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum deum sibi esse*. The argument runs as follows: "Nobody will think of excising eating and drinking from the list of *naturalia*; eating and drinking are closely associated with sleep, for they are a preparation for it < ; now, if the 'preparation' is natural, so much the more that which is prepared! ">. In the next sentence these three functions are described as being on the same level; by quoting Genesis Tert. shows that sleep is natural to an even higher degree than eating and drinking, because *in primordio* it preceded them. "But this you can only know, *si apud deum discas!*" *praeparatura* (also *adv. Marc.* 4, 13 (458, 5); 4, 18 = 478, 16) is Tp. — **inbutus**: cf. the note on 31, 2. — **Si . . . discas**: cf. 13, 3. — **fons generis**: cf. comm. on 20, 6. — **ante ebibit . . . profatus est**: similarly, *res.* 61 (122, 11/2): *denique Adam ante nomina animalibus enuntiavit quam de arbore decerpserit, ante etiam prophetavit quam voravit*. In this statement of a precedence of sleep over eating and drinking we may see the influence of Tert.'s Montanism (cf. *res.* 61: *ante . . . prophetavit quam voravit*). — **ebibit soporem**: Tert. follows the example of Isai. 51, 17: *usque ad fundum calicis soporis bibisti* or of passages from pagan poetry such as Ovid *trist.* 4, 1, 47: *soporiferae biberem si pocula Lethes*. Tert. frequently uses *ebibere* metaphorically, e. g. *res.* 25 (61, 7); *pud.* 16 (254, 2); cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 181. — **dormiit**: probably equivalent to *obdormivit*, cf. 45, 3. — **profatus est**: προφῆτευσεν (thus already Liv. Andron. *ap. Gell.* 3, 16; Lucr. 1, 739; Petron. 89, 1, 4; Ulpian. *dig.* 21, 1, 9); an allusion to Gen. 2, 23, for which cf. the note on 11, 4. — **naturalem . . . principaliorem**: Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 37) regards *naturalem indicem* as the object of the sentence, *somnum . . . principaliorem* as an apposition to it, and translates: "damit man ein Anzeichen der Naturgemässheit erblicke: den Umstand, dass der Schlaf vor allen naturgemässen Dingen den Vorrang hat". It may be preferable to regard *somnum . . . principaliorem* as the object, and *naturalem indicem* as a predicative

accus.: "so that we may regard the fact that sleep takes precedence over all natural things as a proof of its naturalness". For *naturalem indicem*, cf. *testimonio naturali* in § 8.

10. *deducimur* = *docemur*, cf. the note on 15, 3. — *imaginem mortis*: cf. comm. on 42, 3. — The idea that the mixture of blood and water flowing from the wounds of Christ represented the origin of the Church is not the exclusive property of Tert.; it is also found in [Cypri.] *de mont. Sina et Sion* (9 = 115, 11/3 H.), a treatise contemporary to *de an.* (text as given by P. Corssen, ZNTW 12 (1911), 29/30): *percussus in latere ventris: de latere sanguis aqua mixtus profusus effluebat, unde sibi ecclesiam fabricavit*. There is, however, a deep-lying difference, for the author of this work makes Ps. 39, 9 his starting-point: *lex tua in medio ventris mei* (in accordance with the reading of the *codd. Sinait., Alexandr., and Turic.*, which have *κοιλίας* instead of *καρδίας*), whereas Tert. associates Gen. 2, 21/2 with Ioh. 19, 34. In addition Corssen quotes Aug. in *ev. Ioh. tract.* 9, 10 and Anast. Synait. in *hexam.* 9 (P. G. 89, 1002; in the two passages which he quotes after these, viz. Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 135, 3 and Aug. in *ev. Ioh. tract.* 120, 2, there is no reference to Adam). This idea is much more common than is shown by Corssen's materials; cf. e. g. [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 15 (165, 13 seqq. Bat.-Wilm.): "From the wounds of Christ there flowed blood and water, ostendens sponsam, id est Ecclesiam, exemplo protoplastorum de latere suo constare sicut constitit et Eva de costa Adae, habentem scilicet duo baptismata, id est aquae et sanguinis, unde fideles in Ecclesia et martyres fiunt (for this idea, cf. *ib.* 12 = 138, 12/5 and the end of this note); *tract. de divit.* 9, 3 (Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten*, p. 37): *quia . . . lateris Adae costa in mulierem versa est, in qua Christi praefigurabatur ecclesia a sopore passionis eius vulnerati lateris cruore formata*; Caesar. Arelat. *serm.* 169, 2 Morin; Avit. *carm.* 1, 160/9. The author of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* (2, 180 seqq.) draws a parallel between the sleep of Adam and the death of Christ, after which he continues (191/4): *huius (sc. Christi) de latere ligno pendentis in alto / corporis exanimi sanguis manavit et humor. / femina sanguis erat, aquae erant nova dona lavacri, / haec populi vera est viventis ecclesia mater* (for this passage, cf. K. Holl, *Sitz. Ber. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1918, 527/8; M. Müller, *Unters. z. Carm. adv. Marcion.*, 101); Prosper Aquitan. *de promiss. et bened. Dei* 1, 1 (P. L. 51, 735 C): *. . . ea scilicet causa, qua ex latere Adae dormientis formata Eva, ex latere Christi in cruce pendentis formandam, ut factum est, praevidit Ecclesiam, quae vere est mater omnium vivorum*; Aug. *civ. dei* 22, 17; *enarrat. in Ps.* 56, 11; c. *Faust. Manich.* 12, 8; *Acta Petri et Pauli* 29; *Pass. ss. apost. Petri et Pauli* 8 (*Act. apost. apocr.* I: 127, 10 seqq.); Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 88 (Anecd. Maredsol. III, 3: 54, 4 seqq.); cf. also Rufin. *expos. symboli* 23: *quia ergo fons peccati et mortis de muliere prima, quae fuit primi Adam costa, processit, fons redemptionis de secundi Adam costa producitur*. The equation 'water: blood = lavacrum aquae: lavacrum sanguinis (= martyrium)', which is much more common, occurs in Tert.'s writings in *dapt.* 16, 2; *pud.* 22 (272, 26/7)

(cf. C. Weyman, *Histor. Jahrbuch* 21 (1900), 215; Dölger, *ACh* 2 (1930) 134); see the note on 55,5. For the parallel drawn between Adam and Christ (starting from Rom. 5, 12 *seqq.*; 1 Cor. 15, 20/1; 45), see O. Küss, *Röm.* 5, 12. 21 (Breslau 1930); W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart 1938), 1/144 and *Soter* 1 (1933), *passim*; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 350/1. It is not altogether out of the question that in the present passage Tert. in covert terms combats the view of Marcion, who in 1 Cor. 15, 45 wrote κύριος instead of Αδάμ to make it impossible to draw this parallel (cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 47/8). — The reading *figuram dabat* (A) should be retained (also in Rufin.-Orig. *homil. in Exod.* 3, 3; Aug. *civ. dei* 17, 4); cf. 18, 4. — **dormituri in mortem**: cf. 45, 3, and for *dormire* = *mori*, Teeuwen, 43/4. — **de iniuria perinde lateris**: all conjectures are superfluous, for *perinde* once more (34,3: *non perinde animo*) has adjectival function: “from the analogous injury to his side”. — **mater . . . ecclesia**: cf. *ad mart.* 1: *domina mater ecclesia*; *orat.* 2 (182, 5); *mon.* 7 and 16; *bapt.* 20, 5; Marcion in *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (581, 22/3); for further particulars, cf. Achelis, 2, 38₂; d’Alès, *Théol.*, 215₂; Janssen, *Kult. u. Sprache*, 12; Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, 1⁵, 312. For the conception that the Church is the bride of Christ (from Rom. 12, 5, 1 Cor. 10, 16 *seq.*, and *ib.* 12, 27 downwards), cf. Knopf’s note on 2 Clem. 14, 2 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 173/4). — **publicae . . . mortis**: cf. 50, 2. — **iam** should be connected with *effingitur*: ‘further’, ‘in a wider sense’.

11. **nihil . . . molitus**: it is evident that a parallel to Plato’s doctrine of the *ἰδέαι* is out of the question here, the only ‘world of ideas’ known to Tert. being constituted by the thoughts of God. In this connection the most important passage is *adv. Prax.* 6 (235, 6/11): *iam, ut primum deus voluit ea, quae cum sophiae ratione et sermone disposuerat intra se, in substantias et species suas edere, ipsum primum protulit sermonem, habentem in se individuas suas <socias,> rationem et sophiam, ut per ipsum fierent universa, per quem erant cogitata atque disposita, immo et facta iam, quantum in dei sensu*; cf. Stier, 82₁; Esser, 159/60; Meyer, *Lehre von den Keimkräften*, 108₂. In Middle Platonism this idea is frequently found, cf. Albin. *Isag.* 9 (163, 12/3 Herm.): *ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἰδέα ὡς . . . πρὸς θεὸν νόησις αὐτοῦ*; Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 15, 13, 5; Diog. Laërt. 3, 69; Hippolyt. *refut.* 1, 19, 2 (D D G 567, 12/3): *τὸ δὲ παράδειγμα τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι*. In the present passage Tert. means nothing else but the *exempla primordii* (cf. 9, 7 and 27, 7), which are clearly distinguished from the *paradigma Platonicum*, the ‘ideal prototype’ on which the world was modelled. — **paradigmate Platónico** refers to *Tim.* 29 B. Though it is quite possible that Tert. examined this passage himself (the preceding sentence is quoted in 18, 12), it is more probable that he makes use of a note from doxographical literature such as Albin. *Isag.* 12: *ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὸ κάλλιστον κατασκευάσμα τὸν κόσμον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δεδημιουργῆσθαι πρὸς τινὰ ἰδέαν κόσμου ἀποβλέποντος, παράδειγμα ὑπάρχουσαν τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου* (for parallels, cf. D D G, 447) or Aët. 1, 7, 4: *‘ὁ θεὸς ἐπλασε τὸν κόσμον πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπόδειγμα*. Of course

the *exempla* (*primordii*) and the *paradigma* (*Platonicum*) which are here compared to each other (*plenius*), are in reality incommensurable magnitudes, for the *exempla* are examples given to posterity by the story of the creation of the world, etc., whereas the *paradigma* is a model for the creation itself. For *lineas agere*, cf. 36, 4, for *manum porrigere*, 5, 6. — *sicut . . . rerum*: the *parabolae rerum*, e. g. Adam's sleep, are equivalent to the *parabolae sermonum*, i. e. the parables of the New Testament, e. g. the story of Lazarus (cf. 7, 2). — *amica . . . prostratum*: the parallelism in this highly rhetorical passage is not complete on account of the *clausula* (*necessitate quietis prostratum* would give the ponderous form of cl. 1). — *quale . . . iacuit*: cf. § 12 *ex*. — *plasticae*: 'the moulding', the *ingere* (26, 5) or *struere* (37,1) *in utero*. This subst. (which seems to occur for the first time in Tert.'s works) is also found in *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 6: *divinae plasticae*; *ib.* 2, 5, 2: *plastica dei* (*spect.* 18 = 20, 5), the adj. in *ad nat.* 1, 12, 6: *plasticae manus*. *Plastice* occurs from Plin. *n. h.* downwards; cf. J. C. Rolfe, A. L. L. 10, 243; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 242/3; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 44. — *expectans*: the reading of A (*spectans*) is to be regarded as a clerical error (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 107₃); the use of *spectare* in the sense of *expectare* belongs to a much later time (Rossberg, A. L. L. 4, 49; Thielmann, *ib.* 8, 522; Widstrand, 4 *seqq.*; Löfst., *Per.*, 216; Wahlén, 178/9; Svenn., *Luc.*, 106. 113; Hofm., *Umgangsspr.*, 38; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 550₄ and 607/8).

12. *patitur*, sc. *somnum*, cf. 4. — *dissimulatione*: in Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1479, 60/1 this passage is quoted under the heading: "actio eius, qui simulat se aliquid non animadvertere, non curare, negligere, ignoscere (sed simulandi notio interdum prorsus evanescit), fere i. q. *omissio, neglectio*", and put on a level with such passages as *res.* 8 (37, 8/9): *virginitas . . . et viduitas et modesta in occulto matrimonii d. and adv. Marc.* 5, 5 (585, 7/9): *omne hominum genus per naturae d-em et deliquerat et rebellaverat adversus creatorem*, in which the meaning 'neglectio' is indisputable (cf. also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 16/7). In the present passage, however, *dissimulatio* has a different sense: the *dissimulatio praesentiae* is equivalent to a *simulatio absentiae*, which for the soul serves as a preparation for its 'future absence' after death. During sleep the soul remains in the body (in 44, 2 Tert. combats the view that sleep is a *secessio animae*), but it conceals its presence (cf. *ut alibi agere videatur*). — *ediscens*: this verb is frequently found in Tert.'s works; the meaning 'to study' > 'to prepare' also occurs in *orat.* 3 (182, 24/5): *iam hinc . . . officium futurae claritatis ediscimus*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 27 (373, 18/9): *ediscens inde a primordio quod erat futurus in fine*; *res.* 58 (119, 12); cf. also 19, 5. — To the present sentence a pronouncement of Anaxagoras may be compared (A 34 Diels): δύο . . . διδασκαλίας εἶναι θανάτου, τὸν τε πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι χρόνον καὶ τὸν ὕπνον (in the *Florileg. Monac.* 171 this statement is ascribed to Bio Borysthen.; cf. Hense, *Teletis reliquiae*, XLVII, note). — *de Hermotimo sciemus*: there is no reason to follow Gelenius in excising this sentence, which is in perfect accordance with the context: "with reference to Hermotimus we shall come to know this", viz. how

strongly the soul *dissimulat praesentiam* (cf. also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 45). — **unde tunc somnia**: this sentence, too, should be retained, as is evident from an analysis of the present passage: “during sleep the soul behaves itself in such a way that it seems to be elsewhere, because it conceals its presence (this will be made clear by the story of Hermotimus), and yet during all that time it dreams. If you ask me whence these dreams proceed, I shall refer to the special activity of the never resting soul”. The words *unde tunc somnia*? emphasize the seeming contradiction between the “concealing of the presence of the soul” (viz. “by being idle”, cf. 44, *vacaturi hominis*) and the dreaming, and so constitute a transition to the next sentence, in which a short description is given of the activity of the soul during sleep, which activity is confined to dreaming (note the similarity of this sentence to the ‘official’ description of dreams in 45, 1/2). — The neologism *ignavescit* (ἀ. λ.) is due to rhyme. *naturam immortalitatis* is equivalent to *naturam immortalem*; cf. the comm. on 17, 12: *sententiam veritatis*. — **servam soporis addieit**: it seems to be necessary to retain this reading (Gel.; *serii soporis* A B), though it is not without a certain harshness. We have here an extreme case of the use of the genit. instead of the dat., *sopor* being connected with *servam*, not with *addieit*. A parallel is furnished by the translation of Rom. 6, 19 (ὡςπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἡνομίᾳ) in *res.* 47 (96, 11/2): *sicut exhibuistis membra vestra famula inmunditiae et iniquitatis*; in this quotation Tert. renders the dat. of the original text by a genit. (the dat. is found in *pud.* 17 (257, 9) and in the Vulg.); cf. also *Pass. Perpet.* 21, 7: *et cum populus illos in medio postulat, ut gladio penetranti* (penetrante some MSS) *in eorum corpore oculos suos comites homicidii adiungerent* (the Greek text has only ὅπως διὰ τῶν ἁγίων σωμάτων ἐλαυνόμενον τὸ ξίφος θεάσονται); in Faust. Reiens. *ep.* 9 (213, 20/2 Eng.): *prudentiam saeculi . . . captivam spiritalis sapientiae subiungamus* the genit. *spiritalis* is due to a conjecture by Engelbrecht (cf. his discussion of the passage, *Ztschr. f. d. österr. Gymn.* 41 (1890), 679; the dat. which is found in the MS is defended by Elg, 126/8). We may also compare the genit. found after *deditus*, e. g. [Cypr.] *de laud. martyr.* 22 (45, 1 H.): *mens dedita . . . servitutis* (cf. Erikson, *Epiphan.*, 31). — **terra mari peregrinatur**: a similar description is found in [Hippocr.] Π. διαίτης 4, 86 (VI, 640 L.): τὸ μὲν γὰρ σῶμα καθεῦδον οὐκ αἰσθάνεται, ἡ (sc. ψυχὴ) δ’ ἐγρηγοροῦσα γίνωσκει, καθορῇ τε τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ διακούει τὰ ἀκουστά, βαδίζει, ψαύει, λυπέεται, ἐνθυμέεται, ἐν ὀλίγῳ ἐοῦσα, ὁκόσαι τοῦ σώματος ὑπηρεσίαι ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς, ταῦτα πάντα ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ διαπρήσσεται; (Tert. may have found a discussion of this kind in Soranus). Cf. also Epiphan. *Panar.* 48, 5: πολλάκις γὰρ φαντάζεται (sc. ψυχὴ) ἑαυτὴν, ὡς ἐν ἐγρηγόρει, καὶ περιπατεῖ καὶ ἐργάζεται, καὶ ποντοπορεῖ καὶ ἐν πλείοσι καὶ μείζοσι τούτων δι’ ὀνειράτων ἑαυτὴν θεωμένη. The passage under consideration is copied in *res.* 18 (50, 10/4): *ne in somnum quidem cadit anima cum corpore, ne tum quidem sternitur cum carne, sedenim agitur in somnis et iactitur; quiesceret autem, si iaceret. ita nec in veritate mortis cadit quae nec in imagine eius ruit.* — **quod**:

cf. 17, 13. — *suis . . . membris*: 45, 1: *et, si caret* (sc. *anima*) *opera membrorum corporalium, suis utitur*. — *eius*, sc. *animae* (object. genit.): the body is 'the servant of the soul' (*ministerium animae*, 40, 2). — *et ratio naturalis et natura rationalis*: ἀντιμεταβολή of the two conceptions which dominate the first part of the chapter, particularly § 7; cf. *cor.* 6, 5/6: *et legem naturalem suggerit et naturam legalem* (*orat.* 1 (180, 3/4): *sermo rationis et ratio sermonis*). This figure of speech is frequently found in the works of Aug. (cf. Balmus, 158; *de trin.* 6, 4, 6: *simplici multiplicitate vel multiplici simplicitate*; *de anim. et ei. orig.* 2, 12, 17: *inobediens misericordia vel misericors inobedientia*) and of authors belonging to the last period of the Latin language, e. g. Avit. *ep.* 33 (63, 24/5 Peiper): *diligenti observatione et observanti diligentia*; Cassian. *c. Nestor.* 7, 3, 1: *vel calumnia blasphematrix vel blasphemia calumniatrix*; cf. also the note on 57, 9. — *per . . . initiaris*: La Cerda observes: "in baptismo, quo repraesentatur triduana Christi mors per trinam mersionem". It is true that in one passage (*paen.* 6, 12) Tert., referring to Rom. 6, 3/4, calls baptism *symbolum mortis*; cf. also the more detailed discussion in *res.* 47 (96, 24 *seqq.*), in which Rom. 6, 5 is paraphrased by the words: *per simulacrum enim morimur in baptismo* (for further particulars concerning the relation between death and baptism, see Lietzmann's excellent note on Rom. 6, 4 (*Hdb. N. T.* 8, p. 65/8) and Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.*, 229 *seqq.*; besides, special attention may be drawn to Gregor. Nyss. *orat. catech.* 35 (132, 21 *seqq.* Srawley); *id.*, in *Bapt. Chr.* (p. 585 Migne); Cyrill. Hieros. *Catech. m.* 2, 4, 5). In the present passage, however, this interpretation is out of the question: first, the context requires that in the last sentence, too, sleep is still discussed, secondly, the words *discis vigilare, dum dormis* can only refer to sleep, not to baptism as *imago mortis*; by this 'initiation into faith' Tert. understands the fact that sleep and the ensuing awakening make mankind familiar with the idea of resurrection. The accus. after *initiari* (*apol.* 8, 4: *talia initiatus*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 11 (450, 15); *Iren. lat.* 1, 1, 11; but *bapt.* 5, 1: *sacris quibusdam . . . initiantur*) is certainly a Grecism (μυεῖσθαι τι). — *spem meditaris* contains an allusion to the well-known expression *mortem meditari*, θάνατον μελετᾶν (from Plato *Phaedo* 67 E and 80 E downwards; for Arist. *Protrept.*, cf. Jaeger, *Arist.*, 101; this idea was propagated in Latin literature by Seneca, cf. e. g. *ep.* 26, 8/10; 69, 6; 70, 18; from Christian literature, cf. Clem. Alex. *strom.* 2, 20, 109, 1; 4, 3, 12, 5; 5, 10, 67, 2; Hier. *Vita Malchi* 9; *c. Rufin.* 3, 40; *Iren. frag.* 11 (2, p. 480 Harvey); [Cyp.] *de bono pud.* 7 = 18, 15/6 H.). These words are explained by the preceding *futuram absentiam ediscens* ('training for', = *meditans*). — *discis mori et vivere*: a similar reference to resurrection occurs in Method. *resurr.* 1, 53, 2 *seqq.*: πάντων δὲ ῥᾶστον μαθήσῃ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ καθεύδειν εἰκόνα πρόσσχης καὶ ἀνίστασθαι. εἰ γὰρ τὸ ὑπνοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγρηγορέναι καὶ τὸ ἀνίστασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ καθεύδειν γίγνεται, καὶ τοῦτο θανάτου καὶ ἀναστάσεως μελέτη (of course influenced by the doctrine of γένεσις ἐξ ἐναντίων, *Phaedo* 71 C *seqq.*); *Constit. eccles. Aegypt.* 117, 32: *ideo tu quoque si dormis* ("wenn du schlafen gehst" Achelis), *aliū diem incipias ac*

typum resurrectionis facias. Cf. also Philo frag. Περὶ ὕπνου (p. 13 Harris): Εἰκότως μελέτην μὲν θανάτου, σκίαν δὲ καὶ ὑπόγραμμον τῆς αὐθις ἐπομένης ἀναβιώσεως τὸν ὕπνον οἱ τὰ ἀληθῆ πεφρονηκότες ἀπεφάναντο. Ἐκατέρων γὰρ ἐναργεῖς φέρει τὰς εἰκόνας. Μεθιστᾷ γὰρ καὶ παριστᾷ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὁλοκλήρου (another fragment of this same treatise is very similar to a passage from ch. 45; cf. p. 483). — *vigilare, dum dormis*: viz. by the activity of the soul when the body is asleep (*nec quiescit, nec ignavescit omnino*, etc.). — For the present passage, cf. Mnesimachus frag. 11: τὸν ὕπνον τὰ μικρὰ τοῦ θανάτου μυστήρια (quoted by [Plut.] *Consol. ad Apollon.* 12 (107 E), who in addition remarks: προμύησις γὰρ ὄντως ἐστὶ τοῦ θανάτου ὁ ὕπνος); Sen. *Herc. fur.* 1075/6: *pavidum leti genus humanum / cogis* (sc. Somne) *longam discere noctem*.

44. *Hermotimus*.

"About Hermotimus the story is told that during sleep his soul left his body, and that his enemies burnt him when he was lying down like dead (§ 1). I purposely mention this story, lest it should be used as an argument in favour of the view (which is common enough though) that sleep is a complete separation of the soul from the body. In the above-mentioned story the sleep must have been a particularly heavy one, as it is said to be caused by the incubus or by a special disease (this in accordance with the view of Soranus, who will have none of this incubus) or again by an abnormality, as in the case of Epimenides, who was asleep for fifty years. It is also reported that Nero and Thrasymedes never (or hardly ever) dreamed (§ 2). In my opinion, it is quite possible that the soul of Hermotimus was no more active during sleep, and that the whole story may be explained in this way. At all events, any solution is to be preferred to the supposition that the soul should be able to leave the body before death. A particularly improbable detail of this story is that this separation is said to have taken place regularly; for if such a thing should have happened once only, we might still explain it as a special warning on the part of God — and in that case it would still be more reasonable to regard it as a dream, Hermotimus being asleep at the time (§ 3)".

The first thing which strikes us in this chapter is a strongly polemical attitude: on no condition the possibility that the soul should leave the body before the moment of death is to be accepted. The reason why Tert. is so vehement about this is clear: the opposite view is very dangerous for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, a doctrine which had already strongly engaged Tert.'s attention when he was writing *De anima*. If it should be possible indeed for the soul to remain a long time outside the body, the conclusion is obvious that for the resurrection, too, it can do without the flesh. In illustration of this thought, we might adduce all but the whole treatise *De resurrectione carnis*.

This very consideration argues for the supposition that Tert. does

not follow Soranus here; the accuracy of this supposition can be proved. We must, however, first discuss a sentence from § 3 in which Soranus is quoted. There Tert. says about the case of Hermotimus: *Genus fuerat gravioris aliquanto soporis, ut de incubone praesumptio est vel de ea valetudinis labe, quam Soranus opponit excludens incubonem, aut tale quid vitii, quod etiam Epimeniden in fabulam impegit quinquaginta paene annos somnulosum*. Here it may be doubted which words must be supplied after *opponit*. It is possible that Soranus opposed the possibility of a disease 'to the story of Hermotimus'; in that case he must have discussed the sleep of Hermotimus and must have rejected a more or less supranatural explanation, as he frequently did. However, a closer inspection shows this supposition to be incorrect. Tert. distinguishes two possibilities: a particularly heavy sleep and an abnormality (*vitium*). A heavy sleep again may be due to two causes: the *incubo* or a disease. Now, a passage from Caelius Aurelianus (see the comm. on § 2) clearly shows that Soranus contested the view that a heavy sleep in general may be due to the *incubo*; hence it may be assumed that Tert. refers to a discussion of this subject, not of the case of Hermotimus, and that after *opponit* we must supply *incuboni*.

The present story is reported by Plut. *de gen. Socr.* 22 (592 C seqq.), Lucian. *Encom. musc.* 7, Plin. *n. h.* 7, 174, Orig. *c. Cels.* 3, 32, and Apollon. *hist. mirab.* 3. Only the last-mentioned account is as detailed as Tert.'s; the other authors make no mention of the foundation of a temple to which women have no admittance. Now, Apollonius in the first six chapters of his work gives excerpts from Theopompus and Aristotle (under the heading Βώλου) about θαυμασίοι ἄνδρες (see the Introduction, p. 47*) of whom Epimenides, too, was one (in the chapter dealing with him Apollonius cites Theopompus as his source); as, moreover, Tert. in the same paragraph gives a note from Theopompus about Thrasymedes which also refers to a θαυμασίον, it may be concluded that for this chapter a book Περὶ θαυμασίων was drawn on no less than three times. Since in chapter 46, where the dream-book of Hermippus is Tert.'s source throughout, a similar note from Aristotle concerning Saturn is found (§ 10), and moreover the wisdom of Epimenides was commonly ascribed to a dream (see the comm. on § 2 *ex.*), we arrive at the conclusion that in this chapter already Tert. used the work of Hermippus, who in his turn had drawn on a book Περὶ θαυμασίων. However, the note on Nero from Suetonius, an author frequently consulted by Tert. (see Introduction, p. 47*), is undoubtedly due to Tert.'s own reading of this historian.

The appreciation of this story by Plutarch and Origen is noteworthy. The former (who wrongly speaks of Hermodorus; he also used to call Epicurus' brother Aristobulus instead of Agathobulus: see Bignone, *l'Aristotele perduto*, etc., 204₂) remarks: τοῦτο μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀληθές ἐστιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐξέβαινεν ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ σώματος, ὑπέκρουσα δ' αἰεὶ καὶ χαλῶσα τῷ δαίμονι τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐδίδου περιδρομὴν καὶ περιφοίτησιν, ὥστε πολλὰ συνορῶντα καὶ κατακούοντα τῶν ἐκτὸς εἰσαγγέλλειν.

Celsus says (Origen, *loc. cit.*): μὲν οὐ τοῦτό φασι, ὡς ἄρα ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ πολλάκις ἀπολιποῦσα τὸ σῶμα περιεπόλει ἀσώματος; καὶ οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἐνόμισαν θεὸν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, to which Origen replies: καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο φήσομεν ὅτι τάχα πονηροὶ τινες δαίμονες τοιαῦτα ὠκονόμησαν ἀναγραφῆναι (οὐ γὰρ πιστεύω ὅτι καὶ γενέσθαι ὠκονόμησαν), ἵνα τὰ προφητευθέντα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὰ λεχθέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ᾗτοι ὡς πλάσματα ὅμοια ἐκείνοις διαβάλληται, ἥ ὡς οὐδὲν πλεῖον ἐτέρων ἔχοντα μὴ πάνυ θαυμάζεται.

It does not seem very probable that this story was found in the *Θαυμάσια* of Theopompus; at all events, Hermotimus is never mentioned in the extant fragments of this book, whereas in his chapter on Epimenides Apollonius explicitly names the historian. For the possibility that it was Aristotle who reported this story (probably in one of his dialogues), see the note on 2, 3.

1. *Ceterum de Hermotimo*: cf. the note on 35, 4: *Ceterum ad Carpo-craten*. A similar brevity is found in *apol.* 21, 3: *necesse est igitur pauca de Christo ut deo*; *pat.* 8 (14, 3): *hic iam de patientiae voluptate*; *apol.* 9, 20: *nunc de manifestis* (Fuld.; *dicam* Vulg.; cf. Thörn., *Eran.* (1916), 97). More is to be found in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 145/6. — The whole account consists of very short sentences, a practice not usual with Tert. A parallel is furnished by *cor.* 1: *Proxime factum est: liberalitas praestantissimorum imperatorum expungebatur in castris, milites laureati adibant* (then a longer sentence follows about the soldier who refused to put on a wreath). *Denique singuli designare, eludere eminus, infrendere comminus. Murmur tribuno defertur*, etc. (the text is completely changed by Kroymann). Of course we must not compare these sentences to the *minutissimae sententiae* (γένος κατακεκλασμέ-νων; cf. Kroll's note on Cic. *Brutus* 287) of the *rhetores Asiani*, which are embellished with all available figures of speech and are mostly parallel subordinate clauses and parts of sentences (since, however, the Greek and Roman theoreticians of style regard the length of the sentence as the only decisive factor, this difference must not be considered to be of primary importance; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 808). — *per . . . hominis*: "using as a pretext the opportunity offered by the temporary neutralization of his existence as a <complete> human being". *occasio* in Tert.'s works often has the sense of 'the making use of an opportunity' > 'the making use of an opportunity as a pretext' > 'pretext'. It is often used in connection with the heretics who, to support their views, quote scriptural texts to suit them, e. g. *adv. Herm.* 19 (146, 22): *itaque occasiones sibi sumpsit quorundam verborum*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 38 (550, 9/10); *pud.* 16 (255, 29/256, 1): *alicuius capituli ancipitis occasione*; *res.* 63 (125, 6): *sine aliquibus occasionibus scripturarum*; *pat.* 6 (10, 20/1): *scilicet interim impatientia ocasionibus legis fruebatur*. We may also compare *adv. Marc.* 4, 9 (441, 20/1), where Marcion's criticism of the account about the touching of the leper by Christ is rejected by a reference to Marcion's assertion that the body of Christ was a *phantasma*: *qui inquinamentum ex occasione phantasmatis* ("through the favourable circumstance that he was a *phantasma*") . . . *evaserat*

(cf. also *adv. Herm.* 14 (140, 20/1): (deum) *licet ex occasione materiae, suo tamen arbitrio bona protulisse*). As in *adv. Marc.* 4, 9 *ex occasione phantasmatis* is equivalent to *ex (bona) occasione, quod phantasma erat*, so here *per occasionem vacaturi hominis* has the sense of *per (bonam) occasionem quod homo <eius> vacaturus erat*. In writings from a later period *occasio* often is completely synonymous to *obtentus*, e. g. *Iren. lat.* 3, 35, 1: (Adam) *seductus sub occasione immortalitatis*; *ib.* 3, 32, 2; 2, 39, 1: *quosdam sub occasione scientiae elatos*; *Liberius ep. ad Constantin.* (C. S. E. L. 14: 330, 5/6): *quod nunc subtiliter et sub occasione nominis Athanasii adtemptatur*; *Act. Petr. c. Simon.* 17 (*Act. apost. apocr.* I: 63, 8/9): *sub occansionem hominis deifici spoliasti me*; *Cassian. instit. lib.* 5, 7: *sub infirmitatis occasione*. The meaning 'utilization' is found in *Praedestinatus* 91: *per occasionem martyrum Dei populum seducebat* (*Labriolle, Sources du Montan.*, 217: "en se servant des martyrs"); *Hegesipp.* 2, 13, 2: *aegritudinis . . . eius occasione*. — *vacaturi hominis*: "the circumstance that his human existence (i. e. with body and soul) would be abolished <temporarily>". Though the words of *Lucianus, loc. cit.*: εἴτα ἐπανελθοῦσα ἐπλήρου (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) αὐθις τὸ σῶμα might lead us to translate *vacare* by 'to be void', this interpretation is impossible; for if the soul resolves "to make the body void by leaving it, because the body (in this case *homo* must be equivalent to *corpus*, see the note on 35, 6) is about to be void", we arrive at a vicious circle. *vacare* means 'to be idle' (almost = *non esse*), as was rightly pointed out by *Hartel, Patr. Stud.*, 4, 78/9; cf. 12, 5. For *homo* = 'existence as a human being', see the note on 35, 6. In the preceding chapter (43, 5. 12) *Tert.* has said explicitly that sleep pertains to the body only; hence these words refer to man in general, but it was only the soul of *Hermotimus* which regarded this fact as a splendid opportunity for leaving the body. — *non adit*: 'has no admittance'. This absolute use of *adire* is frequently found in connection with private property (*Thes. l. L. I*: 618, 15/23) or sanctuaries (*ib.* 617, 72/8); cf. e. g. *Priap.* 14, 4: *quod metuas adire, non est*.

2. Instead of *ne B* has *ut ne* (*Reifferscheid* writes *utne* and assumes an interrogative sentence, which is certainly wrong); *Hoppe (Beitr.*, 132) seems inclined to adopt this reading. Since, however, *ut ne*, though frequently found in the works of *Apul.* and *Gell.* (*Kühn.-Stegm.*, 2, 209; *Hofm., Synt.*, 762), is extremely rare in Christian literature, and, to my knowledge, is found nowhere in *Tert.*'s works, it seems preferable to follow *A.* Cf. *bapt.* 5, 5: *quorsum ista retulimus? ne quis . . . credat*. — *secessionem*: cf. 58, 4 *secedit*; *Prud. Hamart.* 918/9: *haec ille* (sc. *Ioannes*) *ante obitum membrorum carcere saeptus/secedente anima, non discedente videbat*. In *res.* 63 (124, 11) *Tert.* calls death *secessus*. — *credulitas*: 'credulity', almost = 'superstition'; this sense occurs from *Ovid am.* 3, 3, 24 downwards. The meaning '*fides*', which is a common one in Christian literature, seems never to occur in *Tert.*'s works. — *Genus . . . gravioris . . . soporis* = *gravius genus soporis*. For this ὑπαλλαγή (which is a very common one from *Cic.*

pro Caecina 20 (*hoc novae litis genus*) downwards), cf. Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 1906, 30/53; Löfst., *Eran.* 8 (1908), 87; *Beitr.*, 105/6; *Per.*, 293. — **incubone**: that Soranus discussed this subject, is evident from Paul. Aegin. (cf. the Latin translation 3, 60 = 36, 14 *seqq.* Heiberg: *De Effialto*) and from Cael. Aurelian. *morb. chron.* 1, 3, 55: *est autem supradicta passio epilepsiae tentatio* (cf. Tert.: *valetudinis labe*). *nam quod neque deus neque semideus neque Cupido sit, libris causarum quos αἰτιολογουμένους appellavit, plenissime Soranus explicavit.* According to Rohde (*Kl. Schr.*, 2, 207₁), the reading *Cupido* is due to a clerical error, EPΩΣ being written instead of HPΩΣ in a MS of the original text; in that case Soranus would have combated the view that the incubus was the soul of a dead man oppressing an enemy during his sleep. In support of this view, Rohde quotes Hor. *epod.* 5, 91 *seqq.*; in *Psyche* 2, 363₂ he gives the following resumé: “Seelen Verstorbenen als Alp, ἐφιάλτης, *incubo*, den Feind bedrückend: Soran, bei Tertull. *de an.* 44; Cael. Aurel. *tard. pass.* 1, 3, 55.” It seems, however, hardly advisable to associate the present passage with these conceptions. For further particulars, see the preface to this chapter. The word *incubo* (not mentioned in Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 136) seems to occur here for the first time (in later times e. g. in Scribon. Larg. 100; Hier. in *Isai.* 13, 20; Isidor. *Orig.* 8, 11, 104; *incubus* is found in Hier. *Vita Pauli* 8; Aug. *civ. dei* 15, 23; Serv. *ad Aen.* 6, 775; *Anthol. Lat.* 358, 9; Isidor., *op. cit.*, 103; in the sense of ‘the spirit who makes men find treasures’ the latter word occurs already in Petron. 38, 8). The *incubo*, -us, Gr. ἐφιάλτης, is a spirit who is said to press men heavily down during their sleep and to have sexual intercourse with them; he is often associated with Pan, the Fauns, and Satyrs. Cf. Tümpel, art. ‘Ephialtes’, R. E. V, 2847/8; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 54/5; W. H. Roscher, *Ephialtes* (Abh. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. XX 2, Leipzig 1900); W. Kroll, art. ‘Incubus’, R. E. IX, 1262/3. Macrobius gives the following description (*somn. Scip.* 1, 3, 7): *quem publica persuasio* (Tert.: *praesumptio*) *quiescentes opinatur invadere* (this may refer to sexual intercourse) *et pondere suo pressos ac sentientes gravare*; in his classification of dreams he connects the ἐφιάλτης with the φάντασμα (*visum*), which is seen *inter vigiliam et adultam quietem* (for further particulars, cf. my discussion of this passage in *Mnemos.*, III ser. 9 (1940), 69 *seqq.*). It remains rather surprising that Tert. mentions the ἐφιάλτης in this passage in which a particularly deep sleep resembling death ought to have been mentioned. Owing to carelessness (which in the second part of *de an.* is not at all rare, cf. e. g. the comm. on 49, 3 and on ch. 54) Tert. may have confused ‘an oppressed sleep’ with ‘a deep sleep’. This interpretation might also argue against the supposition that the story of Hermetimus might be found in Soranus’ work. — *ut de incubone praesumptio est*: “as <the sleep caused by> the incubus is thought to be”; *de incubone*, sc. *ortus somnus*. Similar cases are found in the note on 10, 9: *erunt et alia genera lucis, ut ex ignium ministerio* (i. e. ut genus lucis quod e. i. m. oritur). — **valetudinis labe**: cf. the note on 6, 8. — **excludens incubonem**, viz. in his discussion of sleep in general; see the preface to this chapter. — **quinquaginta**:

the same number is mentioned by Varro *l. l.* 7, 1, 3 and Plut. *An seni ger. resp.* 1 (784 A); the usual statement is 57 years (Phlegon quoted by Diog. Laërt. 1, 109; cf. Pausan. 1, 14, 4; Maxim. Tyr. 10; Plin. *n. h.* 7, 175; Apollon. *hist. mirab.* 3). — *somniciosum*: ironically for *dormientem*, as *veterinosum* (36, 1) for *veterem* (28, 1). The story of Epimenides was reported by Theopompus in his *Θαυμάσια*, as we are told by Apollon. *hist. mirab.* 3 (cf. the preface to this chapter); Diog. Laërt. 1, 109; *ib.* 115. Tert. must have regarded this case as similar to that of Hermotimus; there can be no doubt that he had read an account containing details such as are mentioned by Suidas s. v.: οὗ λόγος ὡς ἐξίλοι ἡ ψυχὴ ὅποσον ἤθελε καιρὸν καὶ πάλιν εἰσῆμι ἐν τῷ σώματι. That Epimenides was also mentioned in the dream-book of Hermippus, is highly probable; cf. e. g. Maxim. Tyr. 38 (B 1 Diels): δεινὸς δὲ ἦν ('E.) ταῦτα (viz. τὰ θεῖα) οὐ μαθὼν, ἀλλ' ὕπνον αὐτῷ διηγεῖτο μακρὸν καὶ ὄνειρον διδάσκαλον. — Suetonius: viz. in Nero 46: *nunquam antea somniare solitus, occisa demum matre vidit per quietem navem*, etc. Rohde's supposition (cf. comm. on 49, 2) that Tert. took this note from Soranus, is highly improbable, for in *scorp.* 15 (178, 11/2) we read: *vitas Caesarum legimus: orientem fidem Romae primus Nero cruentavit* (again from Suet. Nero, ch. 16). — Thrasympeden: the only other account occurs in Plut. *de defect. orac.* 50 (437 F): τῶν δὲ πρεσβυτέρων ταῦτ' οὗτο λέγεται (viz. οὐποτε ἐνύπνιον ἐσχηκέναι) περὶ Θρασυμήδους τοῦ Ἡραιέως; cf. the preface to this chapter. — *nisi . . . suos*: from these words it is evident that Tert. indeed consulted the passage from Suetonius.

3. *divortium*, a somewhat stronger expression than *secessio* (§ 2); cf. the note on 7, 3. — *licentiam . . . fugitivae* may be a reminiscence of *fuga* (a treatise contemporary to *de an.*) 11, 3: *ex licentia fugae*. — *ex forma*: this is one of the very rare passages in which *ex forma* (*forma* = 'rule', cf. 2, 2) is not followed by a genit. Thörnell (Eran. 16 (1916), 119) rightly interprets '*ex certa lege*' (the doubts of Löfst., *Krit.*, 111₂, are not justified). Cf. *apol.* 7, 6 (Vulg.): *cum vel ex forma omnibus mysteriis silentii fides debeatur*; *Apul. met.* 7, 25 (173, 2/3 Helm): *ceterum plagis non magnopere commovebar quippe consuetus ex forma* ('regularly') *concidi fustibus* (*ex forma* was cancelled by Oudendorp, but defended by J. v. d. Vliet (A. L. L. 10, 386/8) in opposition to Blümner's conjectures *ex formula* and *ex norma*); *Fronto ad M. Caes.* 5, 37 (52) (p. 87 Naber): *petit nunc procurationem ex forma* ('in due form' C. R. Haines) *suo loco ac iusto tempore*. These instances show that the rule that in this case to *forma* a genit. or an attribute must be added, is not absolutely without exceptions, as was assumed by Löfstedt (*Krit.*, 23; *Apol.*, 26/7) and Tidner (*Did.*, 236). — *deliquium . . . animae*: this expression is due to conceptions such as occur in 41, 2; cf. also the use of *obumbrare* in 45, 6. — *persuaderer*: for the use of the pass. of *persuadere* (from *Rhet. Herenn.* 1, 6, 9, 10 downwards; Hofm., *Synt.*, 377) in Tert.'s works, see Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 11. — *congruere* is very rarely followed by an *accus. c. inf.* (from *Apul. met.* 3, 3 and *Frag. Murator.* 67 downwards); cf. *Thes. l. l.* IV: 301, 61/5;

Engelbrecht, *Claud. Mam.*, 465. — **in proximo** = *proximum*, 'obvious', cf. e. g. Gell. 3, 14, 12: *cum obvium proximumque esset dicere* The superlat. has become strictly equivalent to the posit., as is shown by passages in which, as in the present passage, *magis* is added to it, e. g. *idol.* 11 (42, 10/1); cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 87, and for *proximior*, Tidn., *Did.*, 204₁. In *proximo* e. g. Luc. 21, 31 in Cypr. *de mortal.* 2 (298, 6/7 H.): *quoniam in p. est regnum dei* (ἐγγύς, *prope* Vulg.); Sirach 51, 34: *in p. est enim invenire eam* (LXX ἐγγύς ἐστιν); *Vita Caesar. Arelat.* p. 499, 28 Krusch. — **non somnium**: ὕπν' ἔν (cf. the note on 2, 5: *non aemulis*), as was rightly pointed out by Thörn., *St. Tert.*, 1, 79; for the subordinate clause introduced by *si*, which serves partly as an explanation, partly as a repetition, see the note on 29, 2. "If this were anything else but a dream (a '*non-somnium*'), it would not have happened to Hermotimus during his sleep (*vigilanti potius accidere deberet*)".

45. *The essence of the dream.*

"The dream is an *accidens*, an attendant circumstance, of sleep. During sleep only the body rests; for the soul rest is impossible on account of its immortality and its divinity: when deprived of the support of the different parts of the body, it uses its own organs (§ 1). It continues to make all movements which it is wont to make, when the body is awake; but these movements remain ineffectual (§ 2). The power at work here is called *ecstasis*; it is to be understood as "a withdrawing of sense-perception and an image of insanity". Already in the sleep of Adam (Gen. 2, 21) sleep and ecstasy were joined to each other, sleep giving rest to the body, ecstasy depriving the soul of it, and from that time this combination constitutes the normal and natural form of the dream (§ 3). However, these movements of the soul, as has already been pointed out, are no more than an illusion. That they are still able to frighten us or to delight us, is sufficient proof of the fact that during sleep we are 'not in our senses'; hence everything we see ourselves doing in dreams, is of no importance whatever and is not requited afterwards (§ 4). "Still we do remember our dreams!" Indeed, for this peculiar form of ecstasy is not a real insanity, but only an image of it; it has the task to take the mind out of itself, not to shatter it (§ 5). Therefore we sometimes do quite sensible things in our dreams (it is, however, also possible that during sleep the mind does not function at all, but that the ecstasy of dream presents 'reasonable images' to us) (§ 6)".

The chapter opens with a continuation of the discussion of sleep in ch. 43. During the sleep of the body the immortal soul is unable to rest and moves in the same way as during the time when the body is awake, but now these movements have become quite ineffectual. The question arises whether Tert. originally assumed such an activity of the whole soul (the mind included) or not, in other words, whether his assertion in §§ 4/6 that during sleep the mind is 'made rigid' is only the outcome of his definition of the 'ecstasy of

dream' as *amentiae instar* or if it was his conviction already, before he was writing this chapter (especially in 43, 12). If the alternative is true, we may assume here the influence of such Stoic views about this subject (perhaps transmitted by Soranus) as are reported in *St. V. F.* 1, 130 (*Cic. divin.* 2, 119): *contrahi autem animum Zeno et quasi labi putat atque concidere et <id> ipsum esse dormi-*² and 2, 55 (*Diog. Laërt.* 7, 50): φάντασμα μὲν γάρ ἐστι δόκησις διανοίας, οἷα γίνεται κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους (according to the Stoics, the φάντασμα is the object of a διάκνεος ἔλκυσμός, a conception fairly similar to the essence of dreams as described in this chapter; cf. *Sext. Empir. adv. mathem.* 7, 241 *seqq.*, *Aët.* 4, 12, 4/5 and *Jaeger, Nemesios, 7 seqq.* and 58). However, Tert.'s assumption of a *stupor mentis* may just as well be explained from his definition of the dream and, moreover, the fragments of the Stoics mostly mention an activity of human reason during sleep, so that the former possibility seems much more plausible. At all events, the movements of the soul described in §§ 1/2 can only be movements of its inferior parts, the mind being described as idle (cf. the view of *Gregor. Nyss.*, *de hom. opif.* 13 (P. G. 44, 168 B/D), of course in imitation of *Plato, Resp.* 571 C; more like *Tert.*: *Lactant. de ira dei* 17, 3), but *Tert.* does in no way tell us what force is active during sleep. We are inclined to suppose that, just like *Plato*, he meant the *indignativum* and the *concupiscentivum* (ch. 16); but it is highly probable that he neglected to think out the problem to its conclusion.

The definition, by which a completely new conception, viz. ecstasy, was introduced into the discussion of dreams, must be explained from *Tert.*'s views as a Montanist. The adherents of *Montanus* assumed that the prophets were 'mentally destroyed', when revelations came to them (see *Bonwetsch, Montan.*, 57/69; *Labriolle, Crise Montan.*, 555 *seqq.*; the only new element consists in the energy used to emphasize this view; for similar views in early Christianity, cf. e. g. *Dibelius'* note on *2 Tim.* 3, 16 and especially *Windisch ad 2 Petr.* 1, 21). We may confine ourselves here to a reference to 11, 4 and to *adv. Marc.* 4, 22 (492, 26 *seqq.*), where interpreting *Luc.* 9, 33 (*nesciens quid diceret*) *Tert.* writes: *quomodo nesciens? utrumne simplici errore an ratione, qua defendimus in causa novae prophetiae gratiae exstasin, id est amentiam, convenire? in spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam dei conspicit vel cum per ipsum deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina.* In this passage the words *excidat sensu* of course refer to a withdrawing of the mind (cf. the expression 'to be out of one's senses'); in § 3, too, the *excessus sensus* (immediately followed by the words *amentiae instar*) refer to the activity of the mind no less than to sense-perception.

The 'ecstasy' described in this chapter is a fairly strange conception, being purely negative. In 11, 4, where he discusses the ecstasy of *Adam*, the *forma primordii* of all dreams, *Tert.* defines it as an *accidentia spiritus sancti*, so that we may regard it positively as an obtaining of the Holy Spirit, negatively as an *excessus sensus* and *amentiae*

instar; the positive element is emphasized by the words *cecidit enim ecstasis super illum, sancti spiritus vis operatrix prophetiae*. But in dreams an *accidentia spiritus sancti* is altogether out of the question, so that only the negative part of the definition retains its validity; hence it is surprising that this form of ecstasy, too, is defined by Tert. as a force (*vis*; of course in imitation of 11, 4). He probably means to say that this ecstasy, as it 'makes the mind rigid', gives free play to the movements of the lower elements of the soul which are no longer kept in check by it; but he is wrong in asserting that this ecstasy is also the force which causes those movements, for they issue from the divinity and immortality of the soul. Therefore it must be stated that de Labriolle exaggerates in writing (*Crise Montan.*, 367): "Or, cette force intime grâce à laquelle l'âme se maintient en activité permanente et éprouve, avec une extrême vivacité parfois, des émotions de toute sorte, tandis que le corps est assoupi et détendu, Tertullien lui donne le nom d'*extase*" (cf. also *ib.*, 370). If we put the facts in this way, we disguise the inconsistency in Tert.'s theory: on one hand he calls this ecstasy a *vis*, on the other he omits to define it as a positive conception (that he wanted to describe it as positive, is shown by the words *ecstasis animae accessit a dversus quietem*, which, however, are also due to parallelism).

Essentially this chapter does not contain more than the points discussed in the above. All the same we should like to point out, firstly, that an 'obscuration of the mind' as described here is incompatible with the argument found in ch. 18, secondly, that the mention of *membra animae* (which are discussed in one other passage (9, 8) only, and then exclusively for a special purpose) can hardly be called a felicitous thought, and thirdly, that the range of the working of this ecstasy has not been clearly described. Tert. is forced to admit that it does not affect the memory, and hence declares that it "does not shatter the mind, but only diverts it" (the definition as *excessus sensus et amentiae instar* makes a very different impression!) This leads him to the assertion that the existence of reasonable dreams may be explained from this 'remnant' of the mind, but immediately after stating this, he fears that his theory of ecstasy may be endangered, and concludes the chapter with the remark that these dreams may also be due to ecstasy — whence they become 'reasonable illusions'!

Tert. was not the first to draw Gen. 2, 21 *seqq.* into the discussion of sleep and dream. In a fragment from Philo's works (p. 13 Harris) we read: 'Ο ὕπνος (Philo is interpreting the same scriptural text) κατὰ τὸν προφήτην (viz. Moses) ἔκστασις ἐστίν, οὐχὶ κατὰ μανίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῶν αἰσθήσεων ὕφεσιν καὶ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν τοῦ λογισμοῦ (cf. Tert.: *excessum sensus et amentiae instar*). Τότε γὰρ αἱ μὲν αἰσθήσεις ἐξίστανται τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ὁ δὲ οὐκέτι νευροσπαστῶν οὐδὲ παρέχων κίνησιν αὐταῖς ἡρεμεῖ, αἱ δὲ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἀποτετμημέναι τῷ διεξεῦχθαι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀκίνητοι καὶ ἀργαὶ ὑπεκκλύονται. So here too we find an ἔκστασις: a withdrawing of sense-perception and of the functioning of the mind. The senses are isolated from their objects, the mind rests and does not give the senses any impulse to activity. As H. Leise-

gang (*Der heilige Geist*, 1, 176/7) points out in his discussion of this passage, we must here take into account the influence of Aristotle, according to whom it is exactly this arresting of the senses that constitutes the essence of sleep (*de somn. et vigil.* 454b 25 and 456a 24). However, Philo has not stuck to this theory, as it would have frustrated his interpretation of prophetic dreams (Leisegang, *loc. cit.*, 178). In his treatise *Quis rer. divin. heres* (257) he interprets 'the sleep of the mind' as an isolation of the mind enabling it to participate in a higher insight into the essence of things (Leisegang, 175/8); this is the very view which Tert. excludes, and which in ch. 47 will get him into difficulties.

In the discussion of Gen. 2, 21 both Philo and Tert. start from the text of the LXX: καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς ἔκστασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ, καὶ ὕπνωσεν. The Hebrew text gives עָרָא עָרָא which only means 'a deep sleep'. That already before Tert. this text was used by the Montanists to explain the essence of prophecy is shown by Epiphanius, *haeres.* 48 (Labriolle, *Sources du Montanisme*, 121/2), who replies: τῷ γὰρ Ἀδὰμ ἐπήνεγκε τὴν ἔκστασιν τοῦ ὕπνου, οὐκ ἔκστασιν φρενῶν, and concludes his discussion of various kinds of ecstasy with the words: ἐκείνη δὲ ἡ τοῦ ὕπνου ἔκστασις κατὰ ἄλλον τρόπον ἐρρέθη, κατὰ τὴν φυσικὴν ἐνέργειαν, μάλιστα δὲ τῷ βαθυτάτως αὐτὴν ἐπενήνεχθαι τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἀδὰμ, καὶ ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ πεπλασμένῳ. Cf. also *ib.* § 6 (*loc. cit.*, p. 124): ἐκεῖ (viz., in Gen. 2, 21) δὲ περιττοτέρως ἐκείνην ἔκστασιν κέκληκε, διὰ τὸ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν ὥραν μὴ αἰσθάνεσθαι πόνου, δι' ἣν ἐμελλε λαμβάνειν πλευρὰν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλάττειν αὐτὴν αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα · ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἦν ἔκστασις φρενῶν καὶ διανοημάτων. Εὐθύς γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐπέγνω, καὶ εἶπε · 'Τοῦτο νῦν ὅστοῦν', etc. Ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἦν ἔκστατικοῦ ἀνδρός, οὐδὲ ἀπαρachoλoυθήτου, ἀλλὰ ἐρρωμένην ἔχοντος τὴν διάνοιαν. See also H. Schepelern, *Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte*, 18/25. Very remarkable is the totally divergent interpretation of *ecstasis* in this passage by Augustine, *de genes. c. Manich.* 2, 12, 16 and *de gen. ad litt.* 9, 19, 36. For further particulars, see P. de Labriolle, *Le polémique antimontaniste contre la prophétie extatique* (Rev. hist. litt. relig. 11 (1906), 97 seqq.) and *Crise Montan.*, 555 seqq.

1. *Tenemur* = *cogimur*, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 47; similarly, *urgemur* 46, 1. — *modicis* = *parvis*, cf. the note on 10, 6. — *exercitum*: 43, 5; the whole passage was copied from 43, 12. — *quorum solacium proprium est*: cf. 43, 5 and for *solacium*, 7, 1. — *vacare* is rarely followed by *ab* (Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 373); from Tert. we may adduce *pat.* 1 (1, 17/8): *cum vacent a sanitate*; *c. Chr.* 5, 10: *vacabat a sensu*; *psal.* 3 (225, 11); *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 4; *spect.* 10 (13, 9); *res.* 16 (46, 22/3); *adv. Marc.* 2, 19 (360, 23); *paen.* 6, 18 (Borleffs; cf. however, Lfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 18); from other authors I noted down *C. E. L.* 1093, 2: *nunc ab utroque vaco*; *Sedul. carm. Pasch.* 5, 197; [Cypr.] *de rebaptism.* 10 (82, 23); for *vacare ab honoribus*, cf. Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 33₂. — *et, si caret . . . utitur*: Tert. does not mean the 'remainders' of those movements which are due to sense-perception, as is the view of Aristotle, but the movements of the soul itself, as they have been described in 6, 3:

ab illa (sc. *anima*) *est enim impingi et pedes in incessum*, etc. (we must, however, consider that this statement was strongly influenced by the context and on no account may be quoted as an illustration of Tert.'s view about sense-perception); the description recalls the Stoic conception of a δόκησις διανοίας (cf. the preface to this chapter).

2. **aurigam**: the choice of the metaphor may be due to the well-known comparison of the mind to a charioteer, for which cf. 53, 3. Gregor. Nyss. (*de opif. hom.* 13 = P. G. 44, 169 C / D) compares the condition of the mind during sleep to a musician who with his plectrum touches chords that have snapped. — **curriculis**: the plural is caused by the preceding *armis*; cf. the note on 24, 4 (for *curricula* as a poetic plural, cf. von Geisau, *Apul. synt.*, 24). — **gesticulantes**: only in two other passages is this verb followed by an accus., viz. *spect.* 17 (18, 22/3): *de spurcitia . . . quam Atellanus gesticulatur* and Suet. *Nero* 42: *iocularia in defectionis duces carmina lasciveque modulata . . . gesticulatus est*. In Petron. 59, 7: *modo versa, modo supina gesticulatus*, the accus. has the function of an adverb (C. F. W. Müller, *Nom. u. Akkus.*, 82; a different interpretation ('sc. *manu*') is found in Thes. l. L. VI: 1958, 78/80). Perhaps we may compare to this passage Plotin. 3, 6, 2: (cowardice may be caused among other things) ὀργάνων ἐλλείψει, οἷον ἀπορίᾳ ἢ σαθρότητι ὅπλων σωματικῶν. For another case where the Stoics used the ὁπλομάχος in illustration of a thesis, cf. Sext. *Emp. adv. math.* 8, 409 (= *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 85). We are reminded here of the description by Euripides of Heracles in his frenzy (*Herac.* 947/9): αὐτοῦ δὲ βαίνων ἄρματ' οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν ἔφασκε, δίφρου δ' εἰσέβαινεν ἄντυγας κάθεινε, κέντρον δ' ἔθεν ὥς ἔχων, χερί. — **Nihilominus . . . non videntur**: the first *tamen* emphasizes the antithesis to the preceding *vacua iactatio est*, whereas the second points out the contrast between the two parts of the sentence. This is all there is to this sentence, which only forms an intentionally obscure introduction to the words *actu . . . non fiunt*. As to the form (not the contents), cf. *apol.* 9, 20: *sed caecitatis duae species facile concurrunt, ut qui non vident quae sunt, videre videantur quae non sunt*. The best interpretation of the sentence seems to be to assume that *videntur* is used here in two different senses: "Nevertheless things seem to happen which obviously do not happen". Of course this has nothing to do with Serv. *ad Verg. Aen.* 3, 90 (*St. V. F.* 2, 938): *visa repente] Stoicos et Academicos secutus est, qui dicunt ea quae contra naturam sunt non fieri, sed fieri videri*. The antithesis *actu . . . effectu* is a common one in Tert.'s works (*bapt.* 2, 1; 7, 2; *res.* 15 (44, 22); *apol.* 22, 5).

3. **ecstasin**: as already observed, the choice of this word is due to Gen. 2, 21 LXX (Aquila wrote καταποράν, Symmachus κάρον; Vulg. *soporem*); cf. Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 368₁. — **excessum sensus** (for the meaning of *sensus*, cf. the preface to this chapter) **et amentiae instar**: the restriction (*instar*) has been caused by the subsequent discussion: a complete *amentia* would have annihilated the recollection of dreams. In other passages Tert. does not shrink from calling ecstasy

an *amentia*, e. g. 21, 2; *adv. Marc.* 5, 8 (600, 22): *in ecstasi, id est in amentia*; for *adv. Prax.* 15 (255, 17/8), cf. Labriolle, *Cris. Montan.*, 370₁ (in § 5 Tert. explicitly points out the particular nature of the ecstasy which constitutes the essence of sleep: *hoc erit proprietas amentiae huius*). The same definition is found in Hier. in *Habac.* 1, 2: ἔκστασιν ὀχλουμένην, *id est amentiam turbidam*; *id.*, in *Ps.* 39; *Rufin. hist. eccles.* 5, 17, 1: *in mentis excessu, id est per amentiam, prophetari*. A much more usual translation of ἔκστασις is *excessus mentis*, cf. *Thes.* I. L. V, 2: 1229, 67/1230, 9; *Paucker, Supplem.*, 251 and *Beitr.*, 625; *Rönsch, Sem.*, 1, 29 and *It.*², 242 (the use of *excessus* in this sense is to be regarded as a 'Christianism'). Without a genit. *excessus* occurs in *Vulg.* *Ps.* 115, 11; *It. Gen.* 15, 12 (*Ambros. de Abrah.* 2, 9, 61) (*Thes.*, *loc. cit.*); *Eucher. de laud. her.* 37 (190, 21 Wotke); *excessus spiritus* = ἔκστασις is found in *Hilar. de trin.* 12, 57; *Aug. de gen. ad litt.* 8, 25, 47. For *Aug.*, cf. *Mohrmann, Aug.*, 177/9, for the terminology in Greek, *Pfister, Ekstasis (Pisciculi, F. J. Dölger . . . dargeboten, Münster i. W.* 1939, 178/91). — *dedicatus* = *initatus*, cf. 19, 7. — *dormiit* is the correct reading; the sense is: *obdormiit* (*Hier. ep.* 51, 5, 3 in a quotation of this same text also writes *dormiit*, whereas in the *Vulg.* he translates it by *cum . . . obdormisset*); the first instance of this use of *dormire* occurs in *It. Luc.* 8, 23 (*cod. gat.*); cf. *Thes.* I. L. V, 1: 2031, 16/67. — *eestasis . . . quietem*: for this ecstasy paralyses the mind and gives free play to the inferior parts of the soul, which fact prevents a complete rest of the soul. — *forma . . . miscens*: *miscens* = *uniens, iungens*, as is shown by the preceding sentence. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 27 (374, 4/6): *in filio . . . miscente in semetipso deum et hominem* and *apol.* 21, 14: (Christus) *homo deo mixtus* (for Tert. a mingling of the two substances in Christ is altogether out of the question; cf. *adv. Prax.* 27 (281, 27/8): *videmus duplicem statum, non confusum, sed coniunctum, in una persona, deum et hominem Iesum*; *ib.* 281, 8 *seqq.* the conception of a *mixtura* is explicitly refuted; cf. *Courdeveaux*, 26 ("une simple juxtaposition des deux natures"); *Adam, Theol. Quartalschr.* 88 (1906), 56 *seqq.*; *Warfield*, 73).

4. *quam* in this passage still has the character of an exclamation (just as in *Plaut. Asin.* 581: *ut adsimulabat Sauream me <d> esse quam facete*), which meaning was lost from *Ter. Andr.* 136 downwards: *reiecit se in eum flens quam familiariter* (= *valde familiariter*, cf. *Vahlen, Opusc. Acad.*, 1, 221/2) in Latin of the classical period, e. g. *Cic. Att.* 14, 9, 2: *itaque quam severe nos M. Curtius accusat*; cf. *Hofm., Synt.*, 462/3; *Krebs-Schmalz, Antibarbar.*, 2, 440/1; *Kühn.-Stegm.*, 2, 480; *Svenn., Pallad.*, 285; *Süpfle-Böckel's* note on *Cic. ad fam.* 8, 15, 2; *Havers*, 26; *Edmar*, 39/40; *Fassbender*, 52; *W. A. Baehrens, Glotta* 5 (1913), 97 *seqq.* (*Hartel, Patr. Stud.*, 4, 8 is quite wrong). — *affecte et anxie, passibiliter* (A): it is not necessary to insert *et* before *passibiliter*: cf. the note on 27, 1: *concipi et confici, perfici*. There is no parallelism between the three verbs and the three adverbs in this sentence, and the last two adverbs are really more closely connected with each other. — *compotes*, sc. *mentis*; similarly, *Liv.* 4, 40, 3: *matres ac*

coniuges . . . vix prae gaudio compotes; Sil. Ital. 4, 806: *metu vix compos Imilce*. For *compos* = *consciis*, *gnarus*, cf. 2, 2. — *non magis . . . coronabimur*: this sentence was imitated by Hier. c. *Rufin.* 1, 31: *quia nec adulterium somni ducit me ad tartarum, nec corona martyrii in caelum levat*. In later times, too, *somnia Venerea* were not considered sinful; cf. e. g. Aug. *de bono coniug.* 20, 23: *neque enim et in somnis peccato fit seminis* (sc. emissio); *de nupt. et concupisc.* 2, 26, 42; *confess.* 10, 30, 41; especially *de gen. ad litt.* 12, 15, 31. The author of [Justin] *quaest. et respons. ad orthodox.* 21 (III 2, 28/30 Otto) states that such dreams proceed from the devil (the same is asserted by Tert. in 47, 1, but he is far from drawing attention to this here: the two chapters remain strictly separated), and are not to be regarded as sins; hence he regards it as unjust to exclude anybody from divine service for this reason, as by doing so one wipes out the difference between voluntary and not voluntary sins; Cassian., *coll.* 5, 3 (cf. also *instit. lib.* 3, 5, 1; 6, 7, 2) expresses himself in the same way. Exclusion from communion was advocated by Basil. *regul. brev. tract.* 309; *Hist. Lausiac.* 68; Timoth. Alex. *respons. canon.* (P. G. 138, 898); the *Constit. apostol.* (6, 27) allow prayer and reading of Holy Scripture. For Gregor. Magn., cf. E. H. Jonkers, *Mnemos.* III ser., 11 (1943), 158/60. According to Origen, the τέλειοι never have sensual dreams (Hier. *ep.* 133, 3, 10; *tract. de Ps.* 15 = *Anecd. Mareds.* III 3: 23, 14 *seqq.*; this is probably a Stoic view, cf. *St. V. F.* 1, 234 and 3, 240 with Arnim's note; we may also compare Philo's words on the sect of the θεραπευταί (*de continentia* 26): ὡς καὶ δι' ὀνειράτων μὴδὲν ἕτερον ἢ τὰ κάλλη τῶν θείων ἀρετῶν . . . φαντασιοῦσθαι). A different view was taken by Caesar. Arelat., *serm.* 177, 4 Morin: *si illa inclusio, quae in somnis etiam nolentibus subripit, sine peccato esse non potest*. Dreams about martyrdom are very common in the *Acta martyrum*, e. g. *Mart. Polycarp.* 5, 2, 12, 3; *Acta Pionii* 2.

5. *Et quomodo*: cf. 7, 2. *ex . . . valetudinis*: cf. the note on 6, 8. — *nec . . . mentem*: *exterminat* = *evertit* (cf. *aliud evertere*), for which cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 365/6 and *Sem.*, 3, 38; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 380/1; Tidn., *Did.*, 89. *avocare* often occurs in a similar context, e. g. Lact. *opif. dei* 18, 5: *avocatur* (sc. mens) *ergo simulacris, donec membra sopore irrigata vegetentur*; *ib.* § 8: *sicut mens per diem veris visionibus avocatur, ne obdormiat, ita <per noctem> falsis, ne excitetur*; *id.*, *de ira dei* 17, 3: *cum soporati sumus . . . animus imagines sibi . . . adfingit . . . avocatque se falsis*. However, according to Tert., the mind need not be distracted by *vacuae imagines*, for during sleep it is 'made rigid'. As it is not sure which source was used by Lactantius, we can no more say if in Tert. the use of *avocat* is the outcome of a certain theory. — *movere . . . evertere*: the same antithesis occurs in the contemporary treatise *adv. Marc.* 2, 16 (357, 22/3): *movebitur, sed non evertetur*.

6. *Ideoque*: we may doubt here whether *que* is already quite meaningless or not. We may best say with Löfstedt (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 97), "dass -que zwar logisch unanfechtbar ist, aber doch . . . ebensogut hätte

wegbleiben können". The first instances seem to occur in Tert.'s works, cf. Löfst., *loc. cit.*, 96/7; *Spätlat. Stud.*, 74 *seqq.*; *Verm. Stud.*, 36/40; Hofm., *Synt.*, 657 (not in Cypr.: Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 69); for the later period, cf. Linderbauer, 95; Skahill, *Cassiodor.*, 188; Svonn., *Pallad.*, 489₃; Ch. Müller, 67; Mörland, 177₃, Norberg, 2, 203; A. Erikson, 77/8; Thes. I. L. VII, 1: 217, 80 *seqq.* For *si quando*, cf. 18, 9. — *obumbretur*: according to Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 369₁, the choice of this verb is here due to Luc. 1, 35; but *obumbrare* is very common in Tert.'s works (cf. the note on 39, 1), and the underlying conception often occurs, cf. e. g. Philo *Quis rer. div. heres* 265: θέμις γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι θνητὸν ἀθανάτω συνοικῆσαι. διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δύσις τοῦ λόγισμοῦ καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν σκότος ἑκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν ἐγέννησε. — *extinguitur* may be regarded as a reminiscence of the image of fire smouldering under ashes, which is often found in this context, e. g. Lucr. 4, 925 *seqq.*: *quippe ubi nulla latens animai pars remaneret* (sc. in somno) / *in membris, cinere ut multa latet obrutus ignis*; Lact. *opif. dei* 18, 4/5; Greg. Nyss. *de homin. opific.* 169 B/C; cf. Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 191. — *ipsum . . . operari*: a similar transition from the *nom. c. inf.* to the *accus. c. inf.* occurs in *adv. Prax.* 21 (263, 27 *seqq.*): *alius ostenditur qui fuerit a principio, alius apud quem fuit: alium sermonem dei, alium deum*, etc. (instead of *alium* Kroymann writes *alius*, but cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 44₁). Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 81 quotes Lucifer Calaurit. *de s. Athanas.* 2, 34 (207, 25/9 H.): *istum sequere, ut . . . inveniatis sic ad consequenda regna caelestia fuisse conversus, . . . sic te transitum fecisse de morte ad vitam* (see also *id.*, A. L. L. 3, 47); more in Hofm., *Synt.*, 590 (the instances from the classical period, e. g. Cic. *orat.* 2, 299, are of a different character); Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 710; Heidrich, 41/2; Y. Englund, 61/2. For *de suo proprio*, cf. Thörn., *St. Tert.*, 4, 127.

46. The significance of prophetic dreams.

"A further examination of dreams is needed, after which we shall proceed to the discussion of death in due time (§ 1). — Epicurus regards all dreams as fallacious; he contends that all things are governed by chance. But if that is true, a dream, too, may chance to be true! Homer supposes that there exist two different gates for true and for fallacious dreams (§ 2). According to Aristotle, the majority of dreams is untrue; but by stating this, he acknowledges that part of them are true. The Telmessians say that no dream is completely senseless, but that the interpreters are often wrong. And lastly, everybody will at least once in life have found that by a dream the future was disclosed to him. I will now quote some famous instances of prophetic dreams with which to silence Epicurus (§ 3)". — Next follows a list of fourteen prophetic dreams: a) dreams announcing future power: the dream of Astyages about Cyrus (§ 4); Philippus about Alexander (§ 5); the mothers of Dionysius and Seleucus; Mithridates; Baralirus (§ 6); Cicero about Octavianus (§ 7). — b) dreams warning against dangers: Artorius; the daughter of Polycrates (§ 8). —

c) dreams announcing future fame: Cicero, Plato (§ 9a). — d) three other cases (Leonymus the pugilist, Sophocles, Neoptolemus the tragedian) (§ 9b). This list is followed by an enumeration of interpreters of dreams (§ 10) and of dream-oracles, after which the Stoic view, which is much in favour of prophetic dreams, is referred to (§ 11). — “But these dream-oracles, like all other oracles, are nothing but an imposture of the demons, who by their very help want to harm us, as they divert us from the worship of the only true God (§ 12). For their power is not confined to the sanctuaries of the pagan gods; they also penetrate into our houses and impose upon us in our bedrooms (i. e. in dreams) just as they do in the temples (§ 13)”.

In the first part of this chapter (§§ 1/3) Tert. collects evidence for the purpose of demonstrating that Epicurus is wrong in denying the existence of prophetic dreams; in this passage we should especially note the appeal to common sense in § 3 (see the note on 2, 1). The notes concerning Epicurus and Aristotle (which are not found in doxographical literature) may have been generally known; it is, however, also possible that Tert. owes them to the very dream-book from which he borrowed the fourteen instances of prophetic dreams, viz. the work of Hermippus of Berytus (see the Introduction, p. 44*), which must also have contained lists of dream-interpreters and dream-oracles as given in §§ 10/1. The last paragraphs (12/3) are especially remarkable: Tert. has just copied from his source a long list of dream-oracles as a proof of the existence of prophetic dreams. In doing this, it occurs to him that usually he has a marked aversion from all pagan oracles (see the comm. on 1, 5: *Pythii . . . daemonis*); so he averts the danger of being inconsistent by the sentence: *Haec quantum ad fidem somniorum a nobis quoque consignandam et aliter interpretandam*, which is followed by a condemnation of dream-oracles as a work of demons, and by a discussion on the activity of demons with regard to dreams in general.

1. The first sentence presents a striking similarity to 45, 1: *Tenemur* (≈ *urgemur*) *hic de somniis quoque (etiam) Christianam sententiam expromere* (*exprimere*), *ut de . . . non modicis iactationibus animae* (*quibus anima iactatur*); hence it seems admissible here to supply the words *Christianam sententiam* from 45, 1 (the editors of the Thes. l. L. kindly informed me that an absolute use of *exprimere* with the sense of *sententiam exprimere* is found nowhere; of course we cannot adduce passages where the verb is followed by an indirect question, e. g. Plin. *ep.* 7, 8, 1: *exprimere non possum, quam iucundum sit mihi*; cf. *ib.* 5, 16, 7; 9, 23, 3; 10, 2, 1; 10, 10, 1; Aug. *civ. dei* 6, 5). The words *de . . . iactatur* are difficult to explain. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 81/2 remarks: „Die letzten Worte desselben (viz. of ch. 45), dass die *ecstasis* im Schläfe wirksam sei, *ut sic nobis sapientiae imagines inferat, quemadmodum et erroris*, leiten zu dem zweiten Punkte *de non modicis iactationibus animae* über, indem er sagt: da werden wir nun auch durch unsere Betrachtung über die Träume selbst bestimmt, darzulegen, wodurch die Seele in Bewegung gesetzt wird. Die die

Träume veranlassenden Kräfte, Gott und die Dämonen, und ihre davon abhängige Beschaffenheit, ob sie wahr oder falsch sind, das ist auch in der That Gegenstand der folgenden Untersuchung". So Hartel does not consider *somniorum* as the antecedent of *quibus*, and thinks that Tert. discusses dreams in ch. 45 as *accidentia somni*, in ch. 46 as *non modicae iactationes animae*. In opposition to this it must be observed that these *iactationes* were fully discussed in ch. 45 (§ 1 ex.; § 2!; § 4 *permoveremur*; § 5 *avocat, agitare*), and that in ch. 46 nothing is said about "forces ("Kräfte" Hartel), *quibus anima iactatur*". Moreover, Hartel is forced to take the words *quibus anima iactatur* as an indirect question; but then the indicat. is not normal. So it seems necessary to regard *somniorum* as the antecedent of *quibus* (*somniorum . . . quibus anima iactatur* ≈ 45, 1: *de somniis . . . ut de . . . non modicis iactationibus animae*). Next we still have to explain the words *de . . . retractatu*. We might perhaps translate: "on the ground of an examination of the dreams themselves", i. e. "of the variety of dreams in practice", as opposed to the discussion on the essence of the dream in ch. 45; this interpretation might be supported by the use of *etiam* before *de . . . retractatu*. However, the parallelism with 45, 1 argues strongly against this interpretation and obliges us here to explain *de* in the same way as in the former passage: "we must express still further (*etiam*) <our Christian view> about the subject (*retractatu*) of those very (*ipsorum*) dreams which move the soul <so> strongly". This interpretation is supported by the next sentence: "<So for the present we still keep to this subject>. And when shall we reach the discussion of death?" So I translate *etiam* by 'still further' (Thes. 1. L. V, 2: 927, 78/928, 60; it is, however, also possible to explain this word as a repetition of *quoque* in 45, 1, the idea of a continuation being sufficiently expressed by *rursus*); the addition of *ipsorum* is to be regarded as a reference to 45, 1, and *retractatus* does not mean 'the discussion of the subject', but 'the subject discussed' (see the note on 2,6). For the use of an infin. after *urgemur*, cf. also 2, 5. — Et hic: for we often say: '*cum deus dederit*' (cf. the note on 41, 3). — *nullae . . . eveniet*: cf. [Verg.] *Ciris* 339: *nihil est quod texitur ordine longum*, for which Ellis (Amer. Journ. of Philol. 15, 486) compares a fragment of Antiphanes (Meineke, *Com. graec. fragm.* III, 149): οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν λεγόμενον μακρῶς, ὅτε ὁ λέγων ὑποτάττει τοῖς λόγοις τὰ πράγματα. The use of the plural *morae* is poet., cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 90.

2. Epicurus: Aët. 5, 1, 2 only says Ξενοφάνης καὶ Ἐπίκουρος ἀναιροῦσι τὴν μαντικὴν; Usener, *Epic.*, frag. 328 quotes Cic. *div.* 1, 30, 62: *Epicurum igitur audiemus potius* (sc. *de somniis quam Platonem*)? *ib.* 1, 44, 99: *Sisenna . . . insolenter, credo ab Epicureo aliquo inductus, disputat somniis credi non oportere*; Petron. 104, 3: *hinc scies, inquit Eumolpus, Epicurum esse hominem divinum, qui eius modi ludibria facetissima ratione condemnat.* — *liberans a negotiis divinitatem*: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 2, 8; *apol.* 47, 6; *Min. Fel.* 19, 8 (Borleffs, *Tert. et Min. Fel.*, 80/1); *Epic. κύρ.* δόξ. 1: οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα

ἔχει οὔτε ἄλλω παρέχει, to which Tert. alludes also in *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 14/6): *si aliquem de Epicuri schola deum adfectavit* (Marcion) *Christi nomine titolare, ut quod beatum et incorruptibile sit neque sibi neque aliis molestias praestet* (cf. Iren. 3, 38, 2 ex.: *Epicuri videlicet . . . Deum, neque sibi neque aliis aliquid praestantem, id est, nullius providentiam habentem*; cf. Quispel, 27/8); for Athenagoras *legat.* 25, cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 217; see also the note on 3, 2. — *passivitate*: cf. 4. — *eventui*: “chance”; cf. 2, 1. — *Homerus*: *Od.* 19, 562 *seqq.* (Verg. *Aen.* 6, 893/6 and Servius’ note; Plat. *Charmid.* 173 A, etc.). As to the reasoning, cf. Macrobi. *somn. Scip.* 1, 3, 18/20 (who adduces Porphyrius, probably his treatise *Περὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου φιλοσοφίας*; cf. Schrader, *Quaest. Homer.*, 1, 352): *latet, inquit* (sc. Porph.) *omne verum. hoc tamen anima cum ab officiis corporis somno eius paululum libera est interdum aspicit, non nunquam tendit aciem nec tamen pervenit et cum aspicit tamen non libero et directo lumine videt sed interiecto velamine quod nexus naturae caligantis obducit.* (20) *hoc velamen cum in quiete ad verum usque aciem animae introsipientis admittit, de cornu creditur, cuius ista natura est ut tenuatum visui pervium sit, cum autem a vero hebetat ac repellit optutum, ebur putatur cuius corpus ita densatum est ut ad quamvis extremitatem tenuitatis erasum nullo visu ad ulteriora tendente penetretur.* — *veritatis* instead of *veritati*: cf. 6, 3. — *respicere*: Reifferscheid’s conjecture *perspicere* is quite superfluous, as was pointed out by Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 104/5), who quotes many instances from Tert. in which *re-* hardly has any meaning at all. Cf. for this use of *re-*, Ahlquist, 124/5; Andersson, 93/4. 165; Blomgren, *Fort.*, 1, 155/7; Goelz., *Jér.*, 188; Bonnet, 232; Svernung, *Eran.* 27 (1929), 54/6 (for *respicere* he quotes Caes. *bell. civ.* 3, 91, 3; *Past. Herm. vis.* 1, 1, 5 Palat. *respiciens* ∞ *Vulg. prospiciens* (= βλέψας); *Interpr. Barnab. ep.* 5, 10 (Heer, *Proleg.* LXVIII); *Alfenus dig.* 19, 5, 23); Lindgren, 23₁; *Pallad.*, 602/3; *Composit. Luc.*, 98; Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm.*, II, 631/2. For this use of *respicere*, we may add *Pass. Pion.* 21, 2: *postquam integra et inlibata membra respexit*; *ib.* 21, 9; *Act. S. Perpet. (Text. A)* 3, 3 (62, 7 v. Beek); *ib.* 6, 3: *respiciens in caelum*; *It. deut.* 9, 27: *ne respicias duritiem populi huius* (*aspicias* *Vulg.*; *intuaris* cod. Lugdun.); Paulin. *Petricor. de vita Martini* 2, 188: *ad laevam sordentem respicit umbram* (= *conspicere* Petschenig, *ind. s. v.*); *S H A Carac.* 1, 6; Dares *Phryg.* 10. 21. 24. 33 (cf. Goelz., *Sever.*, 25₆); Gen. 13, 14 in Clem. *Corinth. ep.* 10 (10, 24 Morin): *respice oculis tuis* (*Vulg.*: *leva oculos tuos*); for *respicere ad* = *spectare*, see Geyer, 50. — *per cornu*: *Lucr.* 2, 388: *lumen per cornum transit*; cf. *Plin. n. h.* 11, 126. — *caecum*: “untransparent”; the same meaning occurs (*Thes.* I. L. III: 45, 30/4) in Germanicus frag. 4, 29; *Sen. nat. quuest.* 3, 16, 5; *Plin. n. h.* 37, 68. 86; *Isidor. orig.* 16, 15, 28.

3. Aristoteles: Π. τ. καθ’ ὅπν. μαντ. 462b 12 *seqq.*: *περὶ δὲ τῆς μαντικῆς τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις γινομένης καὶ λεγομένης συμβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνυπνίων οὔτε καταφρονῆσαι ῥᾶδιον οὔτε πεισθῆναι.* Nothing about this δόγμα of Aristotle is found in doxographical literature. The tradition of the following words is certainly corrupt (*maiore mendacio recitans* A), but

the sense is clear: by declaring that most dreams are fallacious Aristotle concedes that some of them may contain truth (hence *verum* in A is right, cf. in § 2 *veritatis* opposed to *fallaciae*). We must assume that a word has dropped out (B inserts *sententiam*). Mr. Borleffs (in a letter) proposes to read *maiore* < *m partem* > *mendacio reputans*, which makes very good sense and explains how the corruption of the text took place: first *partem* dropped out, after which *reputans* (which had become unintelligible) was replaced by *recitans* (as a parallel we may quote *fuga* 14, 2, where Junius' conjecture *reputa* (codd. *recita*) is certainly right), and *maiozem*, which now stood before *mendacio*, was altered into *maiore*. *Reputare* then gets the sense of *deputare* as in 12, 6: *ambobus haec omnia reputari* (cf. also 37, 7). Perhaps we may go a little farther still and read *maiore* < *m partem* > *mendaciore* < *m* > *putans* (the compar. *mendaciora* occurs in 33, 10); but Borleffs' conjecture has the advantage that it leaves the antithesis *mendacio-verum* intact (§ 2 *veritatis*, *fallaciae*). — **Telmessenses**: Cic. *div.* 1, 41, 91: *Telmessus in Caria est, qua in urbe excellit haruspicum disciplina*; *ib.* 1, 42, 94; Hdt. 1, 78. 84; Plin. *n. h.* 30, 6; Arrian. *Anab.* 1, 25, 8; Tatian. *orat.* 1; Euseb. *praep. evang.* 10, 6, 1; cf. Wolff, *Porphyr. de oracul.*, 60₂. — **evacuant**: "id est vacua esse et inania praedicant" (Junius); cf. the use of *privare* = *privum facere* in 2, 2 and the note on 31, 1. For the sense we may compare Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 4, 12 (Balbus the Stoic is speaking): *signa ostenduntur a diis rerum futurarum; in his si qui erraverunt, non deorum natura, sed hominum coniectura peccavit*; *div.* 1, 52, 118: *male coniecta maleque interpretata falsa sunt non rerum vitio, sed interpretum inscientia*. — **Epicuro pudorem imperabo**: similarly, 50, 2: *ut . . . Epicuri stupor suffundatur*.

4. **Astyages, etc.**: Hdt. 1, 107 (Justin. 1, 4, 2/3; Val. Max. 1, 7 *ext.* 5). For quotations from Herodotus in Christian writers, cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 194 (Athenagoras takes them from Apollodorus: *ib.* 223₂; Puech, *Apol.*, 178₂) and *Kyn.*, 97. Further quotations by Tert. are found in 49, 2. 57, 10 (according to Rohde, *Rh. Mus.* 37 (1882), 466/7 = *Kl. Schr.*, 2, 206, all three were taken from Hermippus, which is certainly true); *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (291, 3/8; Hdt. 1, 216; cf. Bill, 10/1); *apol.* 9, 9 (Hdt. 4, 70); *ad nat.* 1, 8, 2/3 (Hdt. 2, 2). — **regnator**: poetical (the style of most of these accounts is very rhetorical). — **vesica** is wrong, for Hdt. has αἰδοῖα. — **diluvionem**: Tp (only two other instances are found, viz. Censorin. 18, 11; Firm. Mat. *math.* 3, 1, 9). — **item**: Hdt. 1, 108 (Justin. 1, 4, 2; Val. Max., *loc. cit.*). — **Charon . . . Herodoto prior**: the same is asserted by Dion. Halic. *de Thucyd.* 5 and Plut. *de Herod. malign.* 20; it is, however, impossible to decide whether Charon was really prior to Herodotus; cf. E. Schwartz, *R. E.* III, 2179. — **tanto operi interpretati sunt**: *t. o.* < *fore parem* > *i. s.* Reifferscheid, but Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 22) rightly points out that in Tert.'s works *interpretari* is frequently followed by a dat., e. g. *v. v.* 15: *hoc nos interdum diabolo interpretamur*; cf. also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 82 and Plin. *n. h.* 15, 91: *sunt qui honori nomen interpretentur*. In the present passage it is doubtful whether we should translate: "have

put him into relation with so great a work" (the instances collected by Hoppe point to this interpretation), or: "have given the interpretation that he was intended for so great a work", in which case the use of a *dat. finalis* as an adjective in 48, 3 (*inflatui pabulum*) may be compared. Kellner's translation: "diejenigen, welche diese grosse Begebenheit auf ihren Sohn deuteten", is positively wrong. *interpretari in* followed by an *accus.* is found in *pud.* 7 (232, 5), 13 (244, 23), *res.* 26 (62, 8), *adv. Marc.* 3, 20 (411, 5), and *ib.* 5, 20 (647, 17), *interpretari ad in adv. Marc.* 4, 1 (425, 16).

5. **Philippus**, etc.: *Plut. Alex.* 2: 'Ο δὲ Φίλιππος ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ μετὰ τὸν γάμον εἶδεν ὄναρ αὐτὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα σφραγίδα τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς γυναικὸς ἡ δὲ γλυφὴ τῆς σφραγίδος, ὡς ᾤετο, λέοντος εἶχεν εἰκόνα. Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων μάντεων ὑφορωμένων τὴν ὄψιν, ὡς ἀκριβεστέρας φυλακτικῆς δεομένων τῷ Φιλίππῳ τῶν περὶ τὸν γάμον, Ἀρίστανδρος ὁ Τελμησσεὺς κύειν ἔφη τὴν ἀνδρωπον, οὐθὲν γὰρ ἀποσφραγίζεσθαι τῶν κενῶν, καὶ κύειν παῖδα θυμοειδῆ καὶ λεοντώδη τὴν φύσιν; *Cic. div.* 2, 70, 145: *Parere quaedam matrona cupiens, dubitans essetne praegnans, visa est in quiete obsignatam habere naturam. Retulit. Negavit eam, quoniam obsignata fuisset, concipere potuisse. At alter, praegnantem esse dixit: nam inane obsignari nihil solere.* — **obsignasse viderat** is the correct reading, cf. *Plut., loc. cit.*: εἶδεν ὄναρ αὐτὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα σφραγίδα. For the omission of the self-evident *se*, cf. *Löfst., Z. Spr. Tert.*, 52/6. A parallel is furnished by *S H A Severus* 22, 1: *ipse somniavit . . . ad caelum esse raptum.* — **naturam** = *pudenda* (from *Varro r. r.* downwards); for *naturalia* used in this sense, cf. *Sundelin*, 68, for *Firm. Mat. math.* 6, 31, 48: *naturale mulieris corpus*, *Löfst., Verm. Stud.*, 157. — **genit-uram**, i. e. *facultatem pariendi* (*generandi*), a meaning which, except in the present passage, is only found in *Plin. n. h.* 20, 196. 259; 21, 142; 25, 74 (*Thes. l. L. VI* 2: 1825, 9/13; *carm. de Sodoma* 4 (*ib.*, l. 11) is too corrupt to admit of a definite interpretation). — **quia leo semel pater est**: *Tert.* alludes to the popular belief that a lioness can only give birth to one cub; this belief, which is mentioned for the first time in *Hdt.* 3, 108 (cf. *Eustath.* 581, 40 *seqq.*), was contested by *Arist. hist. anim.* 6, 31 (579b 2), *Plin. n. h.* 8, 43, and *Aelian. hist. anim.* 4, 34. The question is discussed in *Gell.* 13, 7. Cf. *Steier*, art. 'Löwe', *R. E.* XIII, 974; *Wellmann, Physiol.*, 77. It is not right to follow *La Cerda* in reading *mater*, for *Tert.* wishes to associate the entire account with *Philippus*. For errors in *Tert.*'s works, cf. the note on 49, 3 and *Index III* s. v. 'errors'. — **Aristodemus . . . portendi**: all attempts to modify the text here are superfluous. *Tert.* means only one interpreter of dreams, but does not express himself clearly, because he does not know the right name, or pretends not to know it (as he is often deliberately inaccurate; for *Cicero*, cf. the instances collected by *Landgraf* in his note on *Rosc. Amer.* 46, p. 106); we must translate: "Aristodemus — or Aristophon <: that is immaterial to me>"; cf. especially *Pettersson, Justin.*, 69. *Coniectans* is a *part. coniunctum*; after *portendi* we must assume an ellipsis of *dixit*. A striking parallel is found in *Curtius* (4, 6, 12): *Ergo Aristander, cui*

maxima fides habebatur, urbis quidem excidium augurio illo portendi, ceterum periculum esse, ne rex vulnus acciperet. For the ellipsis of a *verbum dicendi*, which in Tert.'s writings is very common, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 145/6; *Beitr.*, 46/7; Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 1, 12. An *acc. c. inf.* also occurs in *adv. Prax.* 18 (260, 22; cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, *loc. cit.*); cf. *ib.* 9 (240, 4 *seqq.*): *bene, quod et dominus usus hoc verbo in persona paracleti non divisionem significavit, sed dispositionem . . ., sic alium a se paracletum* (Kroymann supposes that before *paracletum* a partic. such as *demonstrans* has dropped out). *Aristodemus* nor *Aristophon* are known as interpreters of dreams; but as Tert. is often inaccurate in this chapter, we may assume that he means the famous Aristander of Telmessus (cf. Kaerst, *R. E.*, II, 859/60), who is also mentioned by Plutarch, *loc. cit.* For errors in Tert.'s works, see Harnack, *Sitz. Ber. Berlin*, 1914, 303 *seqq.*; Waltz., *Ét.*, 368; Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 68, and 101 *seqq.* — *coniectans*: this verb is used to denote the interpreting of dreams from Val. Max. 8, 11, 2 and Suet. *Nero* 6 downwards.

6. *Dionysii*: Cic. *div.* 1, 20, 39 (Val. Max. 1, 7 *ext.* 7 reports a dream dreamt by his mother before his birth). — *Seleuco*: Justin. 15, 4, 2/4: *huius quoque virtus clara et origo admirabilis fuit; si quidem mater eius Laudice, cum nupta esset Antiocho, claro inter Philippi duces viro, visa sibi est per quietem ex concubitu Apollinis concepisse, gravidamque factam munus concubitus a deo anulum accepisse, in cuius gemma anchora sculpta esset; iussaque donum filio, quem peperisset, dare*; Appian. *Syr.* 56. — *Heraclides* was much interested in prognostication, cf. Cic. *divin.* 1, 23, 46; Boyancé, *Rev. Ét. Anc.* 36 (1934), 334. — *promulgavit* (A) is the correct reading: it is *lectio difficilior* and is supported by other passages, where Tert. uses this law term instead of *provulgare*, e. g. *pud.* 1 (220, 8/9): *illic eiusmodi paenitentia promulganda est*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 5 (431, 9); *apol.* 10, 7; *ib.* 11, 8: (Lucullus) *qui primus cerasia ex Ponto Italiae promulgavit* (correction of *ad nat.* 2, 16, 5: *cerasium C n. Pompeius de Ponto <primus Ita>liae pro volgavit*); *res.* 11 (39, 27); *adv. Marc.* 2, 19 (360, 26); 4, 2 (426, 8); 4, 33 (532, 10); 4, 34 (537, 15); *adv. Herm.* 26 (154, 21); *praescr.* 20, 19; *pall.* 3, 7; *idol.* 22 (56, 3); *provulgare* e. g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (513, 10); *si alium deum provulgasset* (M R¹; m- R³ *vulgo*); *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1 (-m- cod. Laurent.; Iun.); *v. v.* 13; *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (489, 15/6). — *enixa* is another poetical word (cf. § 4 *regnator*), but is also due to the *clausula* (1 γ). — *Mithridaten*: we have no other accounts of this dream; Oehler adduces Strabo 7, 309, which only deals with the beginning of the first Mithridatic war. — *Baraliren*: this must refer to *Bardylis* (Cic. *de off.* 2, 11, 40: *Bardylis, Illyrius latro*; Lucian. *Macrob.* 10; Diodor. *Sic.* 16, 4, 4 *seqq.*) or *Bradyllis* (Helladius *ap. Phot.* 530 A 36); there are no other instances of the form *Baralires*, which way be due to parallelism with *Mithridaten* (4 syllables). — *a Molossis usque Macedoniam*: names of countries are found in prose after *usque* (without *ad* or *in*) from Plin. *n. h.* 6, 181: *usque Meroen* downwards; from Tert. cf. *adv. Iud.* 7, 54: *usque Aethiopiam*; cf. Wölfflin A. L. L. 4, 54 *seqq.*; Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibar.*, s. v. *usque*; Kühn.-Stegm., II, 1: 574; Hofm., *Synt.*, 498.

7. **privatum loci**: the genit. seems to be a Grecism, as in *pall.* 4, 5: *insignes libidinum*; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 21/4. — **Marcus Tullius**: Suet. *Aug.* 94: *M. Cicero C. Caesarem in Capitolium prosecutus, somnium pristinae noctis familiaribus forte narrabat: puerum facie liberali, demissum e caelo catena aurea, ad fores Capitoli constitisse eique Iovem flagellum tradidisse; deinde repente Augusto viso, quem ignotum plerisque adhuc avunculus Caesar ad sacrificandum acciverat, affirmavit ipsum esse, cuius imago secundum quietem sibi obversata sit*; Dio Cass. 45, 2, 1 *seqq.* (Xiphilin. 37, 11 = p. 498 Boissevain; Zonaras 10, 13); Plut. *Cic.* 44. *sibi*, sc. *Ciceroni* (not *Iulio Octavio*), cf. Plut., *loc. cit.*: τοιοῦτόν φασιν ἐνὺπνιον ἰδόντα τὸν Κικέρωνα τὴν μὲν ἰδέαν τοῦ παιδὸς ἐκμεμάχθαι καὶ κατέχειν ἐναργῶς, αὐτὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίστασθαι; Suet., *loc. cit.* — **sepultorem**: Tp (also in *adv. Marc.* 4, 43 = 565, 20). For the metaphor, cf. Amm. Marc. 26, 9, 9: *discordiarum civilium gliscentes turbines sepelivit*. — **In Vitelliis commentariis**: cf. my discussion of this passage, *Mnemos.* III 3 (1936), 170/1, where I have defended the traditional reading by referring to Tac. *ann.* 3, 72: *Aemilia monumenta*, which refers to the *gens*, whereas *ib.* 14, 40: *Aemiliana praedia*, the estate of an individual member of the *gens* is meant. The *Vitellii commentarii* must have been a family-chronicle, which was regarded as a *monumentum gentis* (to the passages quoted there we may add Gell. 3, 7: *monumentis signis statu is elogiis h i s t o r i i s aliisque rebus*). Perhaps a vestige of this chronicle is found in Suet. *Vitell.* 1, 2: *extat Q. Elogii ad Quintum Vitellium Divi Augusti quaestorem libellus, quo continetur, Vitellios Fauno Aboriginum rege et Vitellia, quae multis locis pro numine coleretur, ortos toto Latio imperasse*. The interpretation of this passage by Geiselsart, 18 is totally wrong.

8. **praedicatrix**: Tp; cf. Mohrm., *Aug.*, 216. — **ut cum**: cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 83. — **Caesar**: Val. Max. 1, 7, 1: *eius* (sc. Caesaris) *medico Artorio somnum capienti nocte, quam dies insecutus est, quo in campis Philippicis Romani inter se exercitus concurrerunt, Minervae species oborta praecepit, ut illum gravi morbo implicitum moneret, ne propter adversam valetudinem proximo proelio non interesset. Quod cum Caesar audisset, lectica se in aciem deferri iussit. Ubi dum supra vires corporis pro adipiscenda victoria excubat, castra eius a Bruto capta sunt*; Suet. *Aug.* 91 (who does not mention the name of Artorius, and so cannot have been used here by Tert.; cf. *Introd.*, p. 47*); Dio Cass. 47, 41, 3/4; Vellei. 2, 70, 1; Florus 4, 7, 9; Plut. *Anton.* 22; Lact. *div. inst.* 2, 7, 22. — **in praelio . . . evadit**: it is necessary to follow Rigaltius in reading *in praelio* (-um A B Gel.); cf. Suet., *loc. cit.*: *Philippensi acie quamvis statuisset*, etc. For the rest of the sentence it seems best to follow Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 82/3. *Alias* is equivalent to *alioquin*, just as in 25, 2: *animam extraneam alias et extorrem uteri*. A B have *relaturum se*, which it is impossible to maintain. Since in the next sentence we read *prospicit de solis unguine*, and both sentences are opened by *ut cum*, it seems advisable to write *de* here too; the accus. *relaturum* may be interpreted with Hartel by connecting it with *de Artorii visione*: “*evadit de Artorii visione <quae indicabat> maius*

<eum> *discrimen ab hostibus relaturum*”. For the omission of the pronoun, see the note on § 5; for a parallel, cf. the comm. on 57, 11: *ex persona Abrahae = ex voce Abrahae <qua praedicavit>*. If we should write *relaturus*, the prophecy would not be qualified clearly enough as being contained by the dream. — **Polyerati Samio**: Hdt. 3, 124; this very famous dream is still mentioned by Fronto (*bell. Parth.*) and Philo (*de provid.* 2, 25; frag. preserved by Euseb. *praepr. evang.* 8, 14 = 390 C / D). — **unguine**: an archaism; cf. Kroll’s note on Catull. 66, 91 and Fassbender, 31.

9. **medellae**: this word occurs from Apul., Gell., and Fronto downwards (Cooper, 32; Goelz., *Avit.*, 386 and 471). The form *medella* also occurs in *adv. Iud.* 2, 69 and *paen.* 3, 7 (cod. Trec.; see Borleffs, *Mnemos.* 60 (1932), 62/3), whereas *medela* is read in *res.* 31 (70,7); likewise, in Apul. *met.* 9, 18 we find *medella*, but in other passages (e. g. *ib.* 10, 3. 19. 25) *medela*. — **Ciceronis**: Plut. *Cic.* 2: τῇ δὲ τίτθῃ φάσμα δοκεῖ γενέσθαι καὶ προειπεῖν ὡς ὄφελος μέγα πᾶσι Ῥωμαίοις ἐκτρεφούσῃ. — **denique**: ‘for instance’; see the note on 1, 3. — **gerula**: cf. the comm. on 19, 8. — **Plato**: Olympiod. *Vit. Plat.* 4: ὄναρ εἶδεν (viz. Socrates), ὅτι κύκνος ἄπτερος ἐν τοῖς γόνασιν αὐτοῦ καθῆστο καὶ παραχρῆμα πτεροφυήσας ἀνέπτῃ εἰς τὸν αἶρα; Diog. Laërt. 3, 7; Apul. *de Plat.* 1, 1; Suid. s. v. Πλάτων; Orig. c. *Cels.* 6, 8; Pausan. 1, 30, 3. Cf. also Artemid. 2, 20 (114, 12 Hercher): κύκνος ἄνδρα σημαίνει μουσικόν. — **Leonymus**: Pausan. 3, 19, 12/3 tells that a certain Leonymus of Croton was cured by Aias in the isle of Leuke; probably Tert. is once more inaccurate in mentioning the name of Achilles. — **Sophocles**: cf. *vita Soph.*, p. 11, 48 seqq. Jahn-Michaelis; Cic. *div.* 1, 25, 54 (who mentions the *aedes Herculis*). — **redinvenit**: α. λ. — **Neoptolemus**: of this dream no other account is known. — **lapidum senia**: cf. *adv. Marc.* 3, 15 (401, 15/6): *nominum senio*, i. e. *veteribus nominibus*; *carm. de Iona* 2: *cinerum senio*.

10. **Quanti** = *quot*; cf. the note on 9, 6. — **affirmatores**: a law term, cf. e. g. Ulpian. *dig.* 27, 7, 4, 3: *adfirmatorum, qui . . . cum idoneos esse tutores adfirmaverint, fideiussorum vicem sustinent*; *ib.* 4, 4, 13; from Tert. cf. also *adv. Marc.* 4, 7 (434, 6); see Leonhard, *R. E.* I, 358. — **in hanc rem**: cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 40; Aug. *contra partem Donati post gesta* 31, 54: *nostra in eam rem documenta*. — A similar list of dream-interpreters is given by Fulgent. *mitol.* 1, 14: *illi qui de somniorum interpretatione scripserunt ut Antiphon, Filocorus et Artemon et Serapion Ascalonites*. It is not out of the question that Fulgentius imitated the present passage, as was already supposed by Zink, *Der Mytholog Fulgentius* (Würzburg 1867), 68 seq.; cf. the Introduction, p. 49*. — Artemon of Miletus wrote a work in 22 books about dreams that had come true, especially about cures effected in dreams by Serapis. According to Plin. *n. h.* 28, 7, he was a swindler. Cf. Susemihl, *Lit. Alex.*, 1, 873/5; Wolff, *Porphy. de orac.*, 63; Oder, *Rh. Mus.*, N. F. 45 (1890), 637/9; Riess, *R. E.* II, 1448. — **Antiphon**: the sophist and enemy of Socrates. The fragments of his treatise *Περὶ κρίσεως ὀνείρων* are given by Diels, *Vorsokr.* s. v., B 78/81a. Cf. Susemihl,

1, 868; Wolff, 59/60; Wellmann, R. E. I, 2529. — **Strato** must be Strato of Lampsacus, who, according to Aëtius 5, 2, 2 (*DDG*, 416), wrote about dreams, and whose work *Περὶ ἐνυπνίων* is mentioned by Diog. Laërt. 5, 59; cf. Wolff, 61; Susemihl, 1, 869₁₆₇. — **Philochorus**: the historian (author of an Ἀτθίς), who was also a μάντις (Suidas s. v.: μάντις καὶ ὄνειρόσκοπος). Hermippus may have used his work *Περὶ μαντικῆς* in four books. Cf. Susemihl, 1, 870₁₇₃; Laqueur, R. E. XIX, 2437. — **Epicharmus**: cf. Lorenz, *Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmos* (Berlin 1864), 298/9, who quotes the present passage as frag. 17 of the *Ψευδεπιγράμεια*: “Hieraus folgt nicht, dass Epicharmus *de divinatione somniorum* geschrieben habe . . .; die Aeusserungen, auf welche Tertullian sich bezieht, können in seinen medicinischen Schriften oder in dem Lehrgedichte *Περὶ φύσεως* gestanden haben. Oder gab es unter den falschen Schriften auch ein Ὀνειροκριτικόν?” — **Serapion** is only mentioned in the present passage and by Fulgentius, *loc. cit.* Cf. Susemihl, 1, 876₁₉₃; Wolff, 64. — **Cratippus**: of Pergamum, the Peripatetic and teacher of Cicero’s son Marcus; Susemihl, 1, 869₁₆₉. — **Dionysius Rhodius**: no author of this name is known; it is, however, possible that Tert. means Dionysius of Heliopolis, the author of a dream-book mentioned by Artemidorus (cf. Kuhnert, R. E. V, 993; Oder, Rh. Mus., N. F. 45 (1890), 638/9; Susemihl, 1, 871₁₇₅). For inaccuracies in Tert.’s works, cf. the notes on § 5 and on 49, 3. — **Hermippus**: cf. the Introduction, pp. 44*/5*. Artemidorus is not mentioned; his acme being put about the year 170 of our era, Tert. could have used his dream-book, but he exclusively follows Hermippus, who lived before Artemidorus (and may have been drawn upon by the latter, cf. Heibges, R. E. VIII, 853/4). See Kraus’ introduction to his translation of Artemidorus, p. VII. — *tota saeculi litteratura*: cf. 57, 2. — *quod . . . ridenti*: this passage should be associated with Plut. *de facie in orb. lun.* 26: ὅσα γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς προδιανοεῖται, ταῦτ’ ὀνειροπολεῖν τὸν Κρόνον (cf. Rohde, *Roman*², 230). Since Plutarch made use of Aristotle’s lost dialogues, and the latter author is quoted in the present passage, it may be regarded as certain that the story to which Tert. alludes should be traced back to this source (cf. also Pohlenz, R. E. XI, 2013). Probably Hermippus found this story recorded in a miracle-book (cf. Introduction, p. 47*). For *nisi si et prior omnibus vixit*, cf. the comm. on 28, 1. — *nisi si* is mostly used by Tert. in an ironical sense, = *nisi forte*; cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 129/31. Hofmann’s assertion (*Synt.*, 778): “bei den Kirchenvätern ist *nisi si* geradezu Regel geworden” is incorrect; cf. also Kok, 148/9 and for Cypr., Schrijn.-Mohrm., 2, 112/3. For further particulars, see Kühn.-Stegm., 2, 417; Dahllöf, 81; Kottmann, 57; Heidrich, 63.

11. **apicem**: I found no other instances of this metaphorical use of *apex* (Thes. l. L. II: 228, 11 *seqq.* only quotes Cic. *Cato* 60: *apex est . . . senectutis auctoritas*, which does not furnish a parallel); from Tert.’s works cf. *pud.* 5 (226, 29): *inter duos apices facinorum eminentissimos*. — **Nam** does not explain the contents of the preceding sentence, but introduces a new argument in favour of the significance of dreams

in general, which is involved by that sentence. — **Amphiarai** . . . **Pasiphae**: cf. the lists found in Orig. *c. Cels.* 3, 34: Κίλιξι τὸν Μόψον (sc. σέβουσιν) καὶ Ἀκαρνᾶσι τὸν Ἀμφίλοχον καὶ Θηβαίοις τὸν Ἀμφιάρεω καὶ Λεβαδίσι τὸν Τροφώνιον; *ib.* 7, 35 (Trophonius, Amphiaraus, and Mopsus mentioned by Celsus); Philo *legat. ad Gai.* 78 (Trophonius, Amphiaraus, Amphilochus); Clem. *Alex. Strom.* 1, 21, 134, 1 *seqq.* Amphiaraus and Trophonius are frequently mentioned together, e. g. Aristides *orat.* 7, 21 and Cic. *nat. deor.* 3, 19, 49; Amphiaraus and Amphilochus: Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 10, 4 (469 D). — **Amphiarai apud Oropum**: for evidence, cf. E. Bethe, art. 'Amphiaraios', R. E. I, 1893/7; Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 116₂ and 119; Schoemann-Lipsius, 2, 341/3; O. Hey, *Der Traumglaube der Antike*, 1, 32₁; 2, 48. In the time of Tert. this oracle still flourished, cf. Rohde, *op. cit.*, 2, 374₁ (also for Trophonius). — **Amphilochi apud Mallum**: E. Bethe, art. 'Amphilochos', R. E. I, 1938/40; Rohde, *op. cit.*, 1, 116₂; Schoemann-Lipsius, 2, 344; Hey, *op. cit.*, 2, 57. — **Sarpedonis in Troade**: according to Rohde (*op. cit.*, 1, 187₃), this must be an error on the part of Tert.: since Sarpedon's body was buried in Lycia, he could not possibly have owned an oracle in Troy. In refutation of this view Immisch (Roscher IV, 400) and Robert (*Studien zur Ilias*, 396 *seqq.*) rightly observe that Hom. *Il.* 5, 684 *seqq.* refers to Sarpedon's funeral in Troy (cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1, 100: (Troia) *ubi ingens Sarpedon*). Zwicker (R. E., 2 *Abt.*, II, 45) concludes from Verg. *Aen.* 9, 696/7 (*Antiphaten . . . Thebana de matre nothum Sarpedonis alti*) that Sarpedon must have been associated with the Trojan city of Thebes. — **Trophonii in Boeotia** (cf. *apol.* 21, 29): Rohde, *op. cit.*, 1, 119₂; 120₂; 2, 374₁; Schoemann-Lipsius, 2, 344/8. — **Mopsi in Cilicia**: Schoemann-Lipsius (2, 348₆) only quote Plut. *defect. orac.* 45; add Clem. *Alex. Strom.* 1, 21, 134, 4 and Orig. *c. Cels.* 3, 34. Cf. Höfer, art. 'Mopsus 2)', Roscher II, 3209 (the other Mopsus (son of Ampycus) is mentioned by Tert. in *ad nat.* 2, 7, 1). — **Hermionae in Macedonia**: this dream-oracle is mentioned nowhere else. — **Pasiphae in Laconica**, viz. in Thalamae (Plut. *Agis* 9; Cic. *div.* 1, 96; Pausan. 3, 26, 1); cf. Schoemann-Lipsius, 2, 343; Rohde, *op. cit.*, 1, 188₅; Hey, *op. cit.*, 2, 46. — **quinione**: see the comm. on 6, 8. — **satiatissime**: this adverb seems to occur in Vitruv. 2, 9, 9 (where the reading is doubtful) and Arnob. 6, 2 only; the superlat. is found in one other passage (Aug. *de musica* 4, 14, 22). — **exhibebit**: cf. the Introduction, p. 45*. — **Stoiei**: cf. *St. V. F.* 2, 1197/8. The influence of the Stoic view is found in Artemidor. 4, 22 (214, 11/2 Hercher). — **institutioni**: 'instruction', cf. 24, 4. Cf. Chalcid. *comm.* 251 (*St. V. F.* 2, 1198): *idemque* (sc. Heraclitus consentientibus Stoicis) *asserit divinationis usum et praemoneri meritos, instruuntibus divinis potestatibus*. — **humanae**: in the sense of an objective genit. this adjunct. is rarely found (cf. Thes. I. L. VI: 3086, 56 *seqq.*); from Tert.'s works cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 25 (370, 13/4): *humanae instructionis*. — **inter cetera . . . quoque**: cf. *ad nat.* 2, 8, 18: *Nam et tunc Pharaeo inter cetera honorum et remunerationum filiam quoque in matrimo(n)ium ei dederat; spect.* 10 (13, 12/4): *daemonas . . . inter cetera idololatriae etiam spectaculorum inquinamenta . . . eiusmodi quoque artium ingenia*

inspirasse; *ib.* 1 (1, 4/5); *adv. Marc.* 3, 23 (417, 4/5) and 5, 6 (591, 5). See also the notes on 9, 5 *inter illa* and 42, 2 *inter omnia*, and Wahlen, 123. — *magis* is the correct reading, as was shown by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 37/9). Tert. mixes up two sentences, viz. *inter cetera praesidia . . . somnia quoque indidisse* and *magis quam cetera praesidia . . . somnia indidisse*. A striking parallel is found in Cypr. *ep.* 59, 3: *inter omnes corporis partes magis os eius et lingua poenas dat*; cf. also *ib.* 30, 4. — *solacium*: cf. the note on 7, 1. — *naturalis oraculi*: for dreams belong to the *divinatio naturalis*, which was distinguished from the *divinatio artificiosa* (cf. e. g. Cic. *div.* 1, 72 = *St. V. F.* 2, 1207).

12. *consignandam*: Tert. is the first to use this verb in the sense of *confirmare* (Thes. 1. L. IV: 437, 34 *seqq.*); the same meaning of *signare* is found in 8, 1. — *et aliter interpretandam*: with these words Tert. introduces the exposition of his own views about dream-oracles, so that it is certainly wrong to follow Rigaltius (cf. also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 62₂) in reading *taliter*; moreover, *aliter interpretari* is frequently found in Tert.'s works (e. g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 43 (567, 19); *ad Scap.* 3; *adv. Hermog.* 34 (164, 3/4); *pud.* 10 (239, 2/3); *spect.* 3 (5, 20/1); *c. Chr.* 1, 21). — *daemonicam*: this adj. may be a Tp (Thes. 1. L. V 1: 6, 52 *seqq.*), *daemoniacus* (Rig.) is used by Tert. to denote a man possessed by demons (*orat.* 29 (199, 24); *c. Chr.* 4, 33; Waltzing's remark in *Ét.*, 287 is wrong). — *qui . . . habitaverint*: cf. 57, 5. — *memorias*: 'graves'; cf. Rönsch, *Sem.*, 1, 44/5; Löfst., *Per.*, 216/7; Tidn., *Did.*, 2; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 93/4; Armini, *Eran.* 23 (1925), 19; for the similar use of *μνημεῖον* in Greek, see Peterson, *Εἰς Θεός*, 1₁ and 60/1. According to Thörnell (*Eran.* 16 (1916), 130/1), *memoria* here means 'legend', 'tradition'; but Tert. is convinced that the gods are *mortui*, cf. comm. on 57, 2. The reading *ad memorias* (B Gel) is wrong, for Tert. mostly uses *affectare* as a transitive verb; cf. e. g. *apol.* 46, 6, 7; *ad nat.* 1, 4, 5; 1, 17, 4; *test. anim.* 1 (135, 1/2); *exh. cast.* 13, 11/2: *cum autem dei sacramenta satanas affectat*. — *ad . . . scenam*: the most important word is *omnem* (= *plenam*, *perfectam*, cf. the note on 26, 1): "to perfect the deceit staged by their malignity". This use of *scena* is found from Cael. *ap. Cic. ep. ad fam.* 8, 11, 3 downwards, and is very common in Apul.'s works (e. g. *met.* 4, 20; 8, 8, 11; 9, 15, 27); from later writers we may adduce [Tert.] *adv. omn. haer.* 2 (216, 13/4 Kroym.): *tota istius erroris et scaena et doctrina inde fluxit*; *Acta purgat. Felicis* (Optat. Milev. *App.*, 200, 18/20 Ziwsa): *semper sic falsum per terrorem, per scaenam, per inreligiosam mentem actum est*; Zeno Veron. 1, 4, 6: *omnem . . . malitiae scenam* (from Tert.?). Lucifer. Calaur. *de s. Athanas.* 2, 9 (164, 6 H.): *scenae tuae machina*; *Consult. Zacch. et Apollon.* 1, 29; from Tert. cf. *adv. Marc.* 3, 11 (394, 8/9): *et utique debuerat phantasmatis scaenam decucurrisse*. — *specie*: cf. the note on 25, 1. — For the belief that the oracles were controlled by demons, a belief which was part of the tradition of Christian apologetics, cf. the note on 1, 5: *Pythii . . . daemonis*. For *divinitatem mentientes*, cf. 20, 5 *diabolus aemulus* with the note; *cor.* 7, 55/6: *si enim mendacium divinitatis diabolus operatus est*; *spect.* 10 (13, 5/7): *sed non ignoramus*,

*qui sub istis nominibus institutis simulacris operentur et gaudeant et divinitatem mentiantur, nequam spiritus scilicet, daemones; adv. Marc. 5, 17 (635, 4/5): ita enim totum saeculum mendacio divinitatis implevit (sc. diabolus); apol. 22, 9: (daemones) aemulantur divinitatem, dum furantur divinationem; cf. also the note on 48, 4: ad lenocinium . . . divinitatis and Bauer's note on Joh. 8, 44 (Hdb. N. T., 6, 129). — medicinarum: this, too, is a commonplace in apologetics; cf. e. g. apol. 22, 11: *benefici* (sc. daemones sunt) *plane et circa curas valetudinum. laedunt enim primo, dehinc remedia praecipiunt ad miraculum nova sive contraria, post quae desinunt laedere et curasse creduntur*; Min. Fel. 27, 2 (imitated by [Cypr.] *quod idola* 7; Lact. *div. inst.* 2, 15, 1 and *epit.* 23, 8); Tatian. *orat.* 18: οἱ νομιζόμενοι θεοὶ τοῖς τινων ἐπιφοιτῶντες μέλεσιν, ἔπειτα δι' ὀνείρων τὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς πραγματευόμενοι δόξαν δημοσίᾳ τε τοὺς τοιούτους προιεῖναι κελεύσαντες πάντων ὁρώντων, ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἀπολαύσωσιν, ἀποπτάμενοι τῶν καμνόντων, ἣν ἐπραγματεύσαντο νόσον περιγράφοντες, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀποκαθιστῶσιν (Tatianus here quotes Justin, whose words, according to Wilamowitz (cf. Schwartz's edition, *Index*, p. 58, s.v. Aristides), are directed against the ἐγκώμια τοῦ Ἀσκληπίου of Aristides; but it seems more probable that the tradition is older, cf. [Apul.] *Asclep.* 24: *statuas animatas sensu et spiritu plenas . . . imbecillitates hominibus facientes easque curantes*); *ib.*, 37; *Pass. Barthol.* 1. — medicinarum . . . praenuntiationum: cf. the note on 27, 1: *et concipi et confici, perfici. praenuntiatio* is Tp. — *laedant iuvando*: this remark is also very common in this connection, e. g. [Cypr.] *de sing. cler.* 19 (194, 7/10 H.): *artificialia sunt itaque semper diaboli beneficia, quibus ingenium suae calliditatis exercens sanctimoniae deditos dolosis commoditatibus iuvat ut perdat*. — *abducunt*: cf. apol. 22, 7: *et quae illis (sc. daemonibus) adcuratio pascua est quam hominem a recogitatu verae divinitatis avertant praestigiis falsae divinationis?*; Min. Fel. 26, 8; 27, 2 (imitated by [Cypr.] *quod idola* 7 and Lact. *div. instit.* 2, 14, 14; 2, 16, 9); Justin apol. 1, 14, 1; Lortz, *Tert.*, 2, 94₂₅. Cf. also Porphyrius' words on sacrifices (*de abstin.* 2, 40): ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια ποιοῦσιν (viz. the demons) μεταστῆσαι ἡμᾶς ἐθέλοντες ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρθῆς ἐννοίας τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιτρέψαι. — *ex insinuatione falsae*: *res.* 2 (27, 9/10): *in alterius divinitatis insinuatione; scorp.* 4 (152, 24).*

13. *non clausa vis est*: cf. apol. 22, 8; Min. Fel. 26, 8: *spiritus insinceri, vagi*; [Cypr.] *quod idola* 6; Cypr. *ad Donat.* 5: *erraticos spiritus*; Lact. *div. instit.* 2, 16, 5, etc. — *pervolatice*: ἄ. λ. — *interim*: 'provisionally', viz. till the Last Judgment; cf. e. g. Tatian. *orat.* 12 (13, 23/5 Schwartz): ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης ἐντροφᾶν αὐτοῦς (i. e. the demons) εἶπασε μέχρις ἂν ὁ κόσμος πέρας λαβὼν ἀναλυθῇ, καὶ ὁ δικαστὴς παραγένῃται. — *dubitaverit*: Tert. frequently puts an *accus. c. inf.* after this verb, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 50/1; Thes. l. L. V 1: 2090, 64 *seqq.*; K. Dienelt, *Glotta* 29 (1942), 120. — *domus*: this form of the *accus. plur.*, which is rarely found from Claud. Quadrig. (in Gell. 17, 2, 5) downwards, also occurs in *res.* 41 (85, 17). For the idea, cf. Porphy. in Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 4, 23, 3: Οἶκος πᾶς μεστός τῶν

πονηρῶν δαιμόνων. — *nec tantum . . . sed*: cf. comm. on 19, 2. — *circumveniri*: the reading of A B (-re) is in my opinion impossible. The varying of an active and a passive infin. is not uncommon (cf. Madvig's note on Cic. *fin.* 2, 7, 21; Kroll on Cic. *Brut.* 196; Housman on Lucan. 1, 9; Heidrich, 40; Axelson, *Sen.*, 57; Edmar, 82; Sörbom, 110; Pettersson, 159; Löfst., *Arnob.*, 93), but the present passage is of a different character; nor does it seem right mentally to supply *daemonia* from the preceding *daemoniis* (for similar cases, cf. Wahlén, 7/9), no other instance of such a *variatio subiecti* in Tert.'s works being known. Probably this clerical error is due to the ending of the preceding *patere*.

47. *The classification of dreams.*

"As was shown in the foregoing chapter, many dreams, viz. the fallacious, confused, and impure ones, are caused by demons (§ 1); it is from God that the dreams proceed which edify us and reveal truth; the latter are also sent to infidels, as for instance to Nebuchadnezzar, who dreamt a dream from God, and many people have learned to know God in this way (on the other hand, the faithful are often tempted in dreams by the devil) (§ 2). A third class is commonly attributed to dreams which the soul is said to show to itself by means of an intent contemplation of the coherence of all things. Since, however, it is impossible for the soul to dream at will, we are entitled to ask how a dream can be caused by any activity of the soul itself. The best solution might be to regard this class (which leaves the soul the possibility to perform its proper functions during the 'ecstasy of sleep') as forming part of the 'natural type' of dreams <described in ch. 45>. (§ 3) Dreams which cannot be included in any of these three classes, may well be regarded as the outcome of this special form of ecstasy (§ 4)".

The mention of the influence of demons on dreams (46, 12/3) induces Tert. to discuss a classification of dreams according to their sources. Three classes are distinguished, as dreams are thought to proceed from God, from demons, and (perhaps) from the activity of the soul itself. This classification was generally known in Tert.'s time, but it referred to prophetic dreams only (in Tert.'s argument this is not always clear and, as far as the second class is concerned, he would not have approved of it in every respect).

A classification of this kind is found for the first time in the fragments of the ancient Stoics, though no text is known in which the three classes are mentioned together. Cf. *St. V. F.* 3, 605: καὶ μαντικὸν δὲ μόνον εἶναι τὸν σπουδαῖον, ὥς ἂν ἐπιστήμην ἔχοντα διαγνωστικὴν σημείων τῶν ἐκ θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων πρὸς ἀνθρώπινον βίον τεινόντων. δι' ὃ καὶ τὰ εἶδη τῆς μαντικῆς εἶναι περὶ αὐτόν, τό τε ὀνειροχρητικὸν καὶ τὸ οἰωνοσκοπικόν, etc. Besides these, the Stoics assume a prognostication through dreams by virtue of the connection of human souls with the soul of the universe, which, during the rest of the senses, enables them to contemplate the coherence of all things, and so to

know the future: *St. V. F.* 2, 1198 (= Chalcid. *comm.* 251): *Heraclitus vero consentientibus Stoicis rationem nostram cum divina ratione connectit regente ac moderante mundana: propter inseparabilem comitatum consciam decreti rationabilis factam quiescentibus animis ope sensuum futura denuntiare* (the right interpretation of this passage was given by B. Switalski, *Des Chalcidius Kommentar zu Platons Timäus* (Münster i. W. 1902), 37₁: *ope sensuum* is dependent on *quiescentibus*: "when the souls are freed from the exertion of the senses"); cf. Wachsmuth, *Die Ansichten der Stoiker über Mantik und Dämonen* (Berlin 1860), 23; H. Leisegang, *Der heilige Geist*, 1, 203/4 (of the passages quoted by Zeller III 1, 352_{1/4} none may be referred to the ancient Stoa with absolute certainty).

This classification became generally known in the form given to it by Posidonius, an account of which is found in *Cic. divin.* 1, 64: *sed tribus modis censet* (sc. Posidonius) *deorum impulsu homines somnare: uno, quod praevideat animus ipse per sese, quippe qui deorum cognatione teneatur; altero, quod plenus aer sit immortalium animorum, in quibus tamquam insignitae notae veritatis appareant; tertio, quod ipsi dii cum dormientibus colloquantur*. For the interpretation of this passage, cf. Reinhardt, *Poseidon.*, 457/9; Leisegang, *loc. cit.*, 205₅ and 210; S. Blankert, *Seneca over natuur en cultuur* (Amsterdam 1940), 204/6. We may be sure that doxographical literature gave only accounts in general terms of this classification.

Posidonius was followed by Philo, who also distinguished three classes: a) (*de somn.* 1, 1): ἐφ' οὗ τὸ θεῖον ἐλέγομεν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐπιβολὴν τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις ἐπιπέμπειν φαντασίας; (*ib.* 2, 2): τὸ . . . πρῶτον . . . ἀρχοντος τῆς κινήσεως θεοῦ καὶ ὑπηχοῦντος ἀοράτως τὰ ἡμῖν μὲν ἄδηλα, γινώριμα δὲ ἑαυτῶ; b) (*ib.* 1, 2): ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἡμέτερος νοῦς τῶ τῶν ὅλων συγκινούμενος ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ κατέχεσθαι τε καὶ θεοφορεῖσθαι δοκεῖ, ὥς ἱκανὸς εἶναι προλαμβάνειν καὶ προγινώσκειν τι τῶν μελλόντων (similarly, *ib.* 2, 2); c) (*ib.* 2, 1): ὁπόταν ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἡ ψυχὴ κινουμένη καὶ ἀναδονούσα ἑαυτὴν κορυβαντιᾶ καὶ ἐνθουσιῶσα δυνάμει προγυωστικῇ τὰ μέλλοντα θεσπίζῃ. For the relation of the second class to the corresponding one in Posidonius' classification, which is not at once evident ("the νοῦς τῶν ὅλων is full of immortal souls"), cf. Reinhardt, *op. cit.*, 458; Cl. Blum, *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* (Uppsala 1936), 66; Völker, *Philo*, 289₄; Theiler, *Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, 136; see also my discussion on Philo's theory in *Mnemos.*, III ser. 9 (1940), 77/8.

In Christian literature the same distinction occurs with this modification that the δαίμονες (or *immortales animi*) are replaced by the devil or by evil demons; the idea that only prophetic dreams are concerned, is gradually lost (as already in the present chapter). Thus Prudentius (*cathe.* 6) distinguishes between dreams proceeding from Christ (73/6), from the devil (137/40), or from the soul itself (37/40): *imitata multiformes / facies sibi ipsa fingit* (sc. anima), / *per quas repente currens / tenui fruatur actu* (it is not altogether impossible that Prudentius was influenced by 45, 1/2; cf. *Mnemos.*, III ser. 11 (1943), 76/7). Similarly, Cassian. *conlat.* 1, 19: *illud sane*

prae omnibus nosse debemus, tria cogitationum nostrarum esse principia, id est ex Deo, ex diabolo et ex nobis. Augustine distinguishes dreams proceeding directly from God (*ep.* 162, 5), from demons (*ib.* 9, 3) or angels (*ib.* 162, 5), and dreams originating from the soul itself (*ib.* 162, 5; *de trin.* 11, 7; *civ. dei* 18, 18, 2). A very detailed classification is given by Anastasius Sinaita (*quaest.* 120 = P. G. 89, 772 B/C): a) foolish dreams sent by evil demons; b) dreams originating from the recollection of what was done during the day; c) dreams proceeding ἀπὸ στομάχου, d) from God, e) from the angels, f) from the soul itself, especially from souls 'possessing the Holy Spirit' (≈ Ioël 2, 28; Act. apost. 2, 17). Gregor. Magn. (*dial.* 4, 48; *moral.* 8, 24, 42; cf. Isidor. *sent.* 4, 13 and 6, 67; Deubner, *De incubatione*, 3₁) distinguishes between dreams which are caused a) *ventris plenitudine*, b) *eius inanitate*, c) *illusione*, d) *cogitatione et illusione*, e) *revelatione*, f) *cogitatione et revelatione* (Blum, *op. cit.*, 64/5 is certainly wrong in putting this classification on a level with that which occurs in Chalcid. *comm.* 256; Chalcidius follows Philo, cf. my discussion in *Mnemos.*, III ser. 9 (1940), 65/85). Frequently one of the three classes is omitted. Thus Gregor. Nyss. only mentions dreams caused by God and by the soul itself (*de opif. hom.* 172 A/B; cf. Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 185/91 and Blum, 68/9); his brother Basilus mentions dreams sent by the devil (*ep. class.* 2, *ep.* 210, 6 = P. G. 32, 777 C), and dreams which are τῆς μεθήμερινῆς ἐννοίας . . . ἀπηχήματα (*homil. in Ps.* 33, 1 = P. G. 29, 353 C). According to Lactantius (*opif. dei* 18, 9), true dreams originate from God, whereas the fallacious ones are due to the condition of the soul during sleep. For further particulars, cf. H. Weiland, *Het oordeel der kerkvaders over het orakel* (Amsterdam 1935), 77/80. Most frequently we hear about dreams sent by demons, e. g. Tert. *apol.* 23, 1; Min. Fel. 27, 2; Justin *apol.* 1, 14, 1; Lactant. *div. instit.* 2, 14, 14; [Cypr.] *quod idola* 7; Aug. *de trin.* 4, 11, 14; cf. the note on 46, 12.

We need not discuss here the distinction of three classes of dreams by Herophilus (Aët. 5, 2, 3), as it is totally different from the classification propagated by the Stoics (cf. *D D G*, 15 and 416, *appar. crit.*; C. Fredrich, *Hippokratische Untersuchungen*, 215; M. Wellmann, *Arch. f. Gesch. d. Mediz.* 16 (1924), 72; Blum, 69; M. Gelzer, *Zwei Prinzipien der Traumeinteilung*, in: *Iuvenes dum sumus*, *Progr. Philol. Tagung Basel*, 1907, 41).

Now we have to examine the question how Tert. works up the data transmitted to him by doxographical literature. We have already observed that he relates this classification to all dreams and forgets that originally it only referred to prophetic dreams. The existence of dreams caused by demons he accepts unconditionally, as it belongs to the traditional commonplaces of Christian apologetics. Dreams originating from God are also regarded by him as a matter of course. As an adherent of Montanism he is particularly interested in them, because he regards them (as he does visions) as an indication of the new time which has now come, the 'time of perfect revelation'. In relation to this idea he frequently adduces Ioel 2, 28, e. g. in *res.* 63

(124, 29 *seqq.*), *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (579, 20/1), 5, 8 (599, 2/5), 5, 11 (611, 11/2), 5, 17 (633, 23), though it is only in the present chapter that he associates this text (and that quite naturally) with dreams (καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὕμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὕμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται; cf. Bonwetsch, *Montan.*, 68/9 and 118/21). The complete text of Joel 2, 28 is quoted in *Pass. Perpet.* 1, 4, where this idea is most clearly expressed; the dream recorded in *v.v.* 17 must be explained in the same way.

The third class, i. e. dreams produced by the λογιστικόν itself, raises great difficulties for Tert., for in ch. 45 he had argued that the dream is a combination of sleep and ecstasy, which makes impossible an activity of the mind during sleep as assumed by the Stoics. Tert. even accentuates the contrast by describing those dreams as an *ex arbitrio somniare*, 'a dreaming at will'. He gets out of the difficulty by a reasoning which is typical of him: the normal form of dreams, as described in ch. 45, leaves the soul the possibility of "going through (almost equivalent to 'performing') its proper functions" (*res suas perpeti*) during this ecstasy: in this way he neither denies the existence of ecstasy nor a certain activity of the soul during sleep, which activity takes place "within the limits of the ecstasy" (45, 6: *ecstasin . . . operari*; 47, 3: "this *species* forms part of the *naturalis forma*", i. e. of the *ecstasis*, cf. 45, 3).

Here again it may be assumed that the doxographical matter was taken from Hermippus (see Introduction, pp. 44*/5*).

1. *etsi . . . sed*: cf. the note on 32, 9. — *affectantia*: 'deluding us with false appearances'; used in this sense *affectare* occurs from Sen. *suas.* 3, 4 and Quint. *declam.* 18, 7 downwards; from Tert.'s works cf. e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 4, 5; 2, 4, 17; *iei.* 2 (275, 30); *orat.* 15 (189, 19). — *frustratoria* (Tp): certainly from the idiom of lawyers (e. g. Modestin. *dig.* 22, 1, 41 *pr.*), as perhaps also *ludibriosa* (from Gell. downwards, e. g. *cod. Justin.* 5, 70, 6). For the antithesis *imagines . . . res*, cf. 7, 2.

2. *ipsi gratiae* is to be considered as a *dat. auctoris*, for it is the grace of the Holy Spirit to which these dreams are due. — *comparabuntur*: a *fut. gnomicum*, but also caused by the preceding *fut. deputabuntur*; cf. the note on 10,6: *erunt haec in omnibus . . . quae vivent.* — *revelatoria* (ἀ. λ.); as an instance of this kind of dream the ὄραμα of Petrus (Act. apost. 10, 10) may be quoted. — *aedificatoria* (Tp): cf. the comm. on 26, 1. — *vocatoria*: ἀ. λ. (but this word occurs in medieval Latin, cf. Du Cange s. v.); the dream of the ἑκατοντάρχης (Act. apost. 10, 3) is of this kind. With the description of these two kinds of dream cf. *Mirac. Theclae* 2 *praef.* C: ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τῶν δαιμόνων (sc. ἐνύπνια), ὡς ἐκ πάνυ πολλῶν ὀλίγα εἰπεῖν, τοιαῦτα ἄπατηλὰ, πονηρὰ, κίβδηλα, ὑπουλα (= δόλια), δολερὰ, πολὺ τὸ ἀχλυῶδες καὶ διεψευσμένον ἔχοντα, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἁγίων ἄρα λοιπὸν ἰάματα καὶ θεσπίσματα, ποῖα; σαφῇ, ἀληθῇ, ἀπᾶ, ἁγία, ὁλόκληρα καὶ τοῦ δεδωκότος θεοῦ ἀληθῶς ἐπάξια. — *liberalitas* is almost equivalent to *donum*, as in *cor.* 1, 1; Tac. *hist.* 1, 20; Suet. *Tib.* 46; *Claud.* 29; *Galba* 15; *Vita Horat.* Cf. the

use of *munificentia* in 14, 4. — *peraequante*: cf. 2, 2. — *maior . . . diseunt*: Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 46: ὁμῶς λελέξεται ὅτι πολλοὶ ὥσπερ εἰ ἄκοντες προσεληλύθασι χριστιανισμῷ, πνεύματος τίνος τρέψαντος αὐτῶν τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αἰφνίδιον ἀπὸ τοῦ μισεῖν τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τὸ ὑπεραποθανεῖν αὐτοῦ καὶ φαντασιώσαντος αὐτοῦς ὕπαρ ἢ ὄναρ; *ib.* 1, 48; Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 6, 5, 6 *seq.*; [Hippolyt.] *in Ps. frag.* 30 (p. 151 Achelis); Hier. *chron.* p. 231 Helm: *qui* (sc. Arnobius) *cum . . . adhuc ethnicus ad credulitatem somniis compelleretur*. — *dignatio dei*: *dignatio* is often used in relation to the emperors, e. g. Tac. *hist.* 1, 52; Plin. *paneg.* 77, 5; *Paneg.* 2, 20, 1; 11, 5, 1; *Acta Cypriani* 1, etc. (Thes. 1. L. V, 1: 1132, 74 *seqq.*); referring to gods e. g. Apul. *Asclep.* 7 (42, 1 Thom.; cf. Thes., *loc. cit.*, 37/74). *divina dignatio* (*d. dei, domini*) is often found in Tert.'s works, e. g. *iei.* 7 (283, 19); *adv. Iud.* 1, 53; *adv. Marc.* 2, 6 (341, 23) and 4, 22 (492, 5); *bapt.* 18, 2, 3; *d. spiritus sancti*: *iei.* 8 (284, 7/8); cf. also *pat.* 11 (17, 12/3); *ad ux.* 1, 4; Kok, 117; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 90/1; Watson, 247/8; Koch, *Gelasius*, 81; Goelz., *Avit.*, 588. It is highly probable that this development of the sense of *dignatio* was influenced by the similar development of Χάρις, cf. Wetter, *Charis*, 15 *seqq.* (particularly 28, where after quoting some passages from the letters of St. Paul he remarks: "überall hier hat wohl Paulus die 'hellenische' Vorstellung der Gnade, und zwar in Analogie mit der Gnade der Kaiser gedacht"). — *ethnicos*: see the note on 3,3. — *ita . . . sanetos*: almost the same thought recurs in Justin *apol.* 1, 58, 3: Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο τι ἀγωνίζονται οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες, ἢ ἀπάγειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρωτογόνου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῆς γῆς μὴ ἐπαίρεσθαι δυναμένους τοῖς γῆνις καὶ χειροποιήτοις προσήλωσαν καὶ προσηλοῦσι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ θεωρίαν θείων ὁρμῶντας ὑπεκροῦντες, ἣν μὴ λογισμὸν σώφρονα καὶ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀπαθῆ βίον ἔχωσιν, εἰς ἀσέβειαν ἐμβάλλουσιν. The martyrs in particular were regarded as being exposed to the machinations of the devil (cf. the passages collected by Schlier, 130). — *a . . . absistit*: this may be an allusion to Ps. 90, 5/6: οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ, ἀπὸ βέλους πετομένου ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει, ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δ α ι μ ο ν ί ο υ μ ε σ η μ β ρ ι ν ο ῦ. — *ut vel . . . potest*: a very similar statement occurs in the *epist. de mal. doctor.* 16, 5 (p. 98 Caspari): *semper enim diabolus mentibus nostris quiescentibus vigilat. nescio, quid non dormientibus faciat, qui vigilantibus nonnunquam subtiliter et latenter obrepit*. Cf. also Caesar. *Arelat. serm.* 177, 4 Morin: *aliquando ista concupiscentia sic insidiatur sanctis et bonis Christianis, ut faciat dormientibus quod non potest vigilantibus: aliquotiens enim inviti et nolentes inlusionibus polluantur* (for the *somnia Venerea*, cf. the note on 45, 4); Aug. *de trin.* 4, 11, 14: *quid magnum est diabolo et angelis eius . . . occultis inspirationibus ad illudendos humanos sensus phantasmata imaginum machinari, quibus vigilantes dormientesve decipiat?* For the use of *obrepit*, cf. Cic. *divin.* 2, 139: *nullae ergo imagines obrepunt in animos dormientium extrinsecus* and a hymn published by Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 79, vs. 8/10: *noctem largire quietam, / ne gravis impediatur mortis caligine somnus, / hostis subripiat (= subrepat) nobis ne fraude maligna.*

3. *ex intentione circumstantiarum*: for *intentio* followed by an objective genit., cf. Liv. 4, 17, 4: *non aversum ab intentione lusus animum*; Quint. *institut.* 10, 3, 23: *avocent ab intentione operis destinati*. As for the meaning ('intent contemplation'), cf. *iei.* 11 (288, 30): *sola . . . lectione, non etiam intentione comperta*. For *intendere* in the sense of *intueri*, cf. Bonnet, 256; Rönisch, *It.*², 371/2; Blomgren, *Fort.*, 1, 174/5. — *circumstantiarum* is interpreted by Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI, 42, as 'der Zusammenhang der immanenten Naturgesetze'. He connects this passage with Cic. *divin.* 1, 125/6, where fate, by the contemplation of which the mind in the opinion of Posidonius (*ib.* 64) unaided sees the future, is defined as *causa aeterna rerum, cur et ea quae praeterierunt facta sint et quae instant fiant et quae sequuntur futura sint*. That the contents of these words were compressed by Tert. into the word *circumstantia*, according to Norden is proved by the fact that Quint. (*institut.* 5, 10, 102 *seq.*) defines the *argumenta ex circumstantia* (ἐκ περιστάσεως) as arguments taken *ex antecedentibus et iunctis et sequentibus*. Though this interpretation is certainly possible, we should not forget that Tert. always uses *circumstantia* in a definitely concrete sense, especially in *orat.* 3 (182, 22): *illa angelorum circumstantia* (frequently the meaning is 'condicio mala', 'angustia', e. g. *bapt.* 17, 3: *cum urgetur — a periclitantis*; *orat.* 10 (187, 12); *iei.* 9 (285, 13); *res.* 30 (69, 3); *adv. Val.* 15 = 195, 3). Since, moreover, it is far from certain that Tert. had a clear notion of the Stoic view that the soul during the sleep of the body may contemplate the future by virtue of the coherence of all things, it seems advisable to translate *circumstantia* simply by: 'the things surrounding it (viz. the soul)': the soul produces dreams by an intent contemplation of such things as are perceptible to it during sleep. — *quam . . . somniare*: the traditional reading is right, *est* being followed by an *accus. c. inf.*; of course the relative clause has causal force: "since it cannot dream at will". — *Epicharmus*: we know nothing about this view of 'Epicharmus', but we may be certain that Hermippus discussed it (Epicharmus is also mentioned in 46, 11, a passage which must certainly be traced back to Hermippus). — *Num* is equivalent here to *nonne* (cf. 49, 3): "is it not the best solution to refer this class to the natural form of dreams?" i. e.: "we may ascribe this kind of dream to the working of the *ecstasis*". The *naturalis forma* is the junction of sleep and ecstasy described in 45, 3: *et inde iam forma somnum ecstasi miscens et natura de forma*. Of this use of *num* more instances are given by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 41/2); cf. also Hofm., *Synt.*, 649. — *servans . . . perpeti*: Kroymann, *Quaest. Tert.*, 116, remarks: "participium *servans* nullo modo coniungi posse cum subiecto *species* in aperto est", and proposes to read *servanti*; this interpretation is rightly refuted by Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 41: "Est . . . *species-servans* = *species, qua servatur*". For such personifications of abstract conceptions, cf. the note on 14, 2, for the use of an infin. after *servare*, *adv. Prax.* 27 (282, 18/20): (Iesus) *quem tunc angelus ex ea parte, qua spiritus erat, dei filium pronuntiavit, servans carni filium hominis dici*. — *perpeti* emphasizes the passive state of the soul during sleep; cf. 9,4.

4. *videbuntur*: cf. comm. on 10, 6. — *praeter opinionem* must not be translated by 'unexpected', for Artemidorus repeatedly says that totally unexpected dreams were commonly regarded as a special gift from the gods; these words are to be connected with *facultatis*: "of whose essence it is impossible to form an idea"; for *facultas* with the meaning 'essence', see my note on *carm. de resurr.* 144. — *ipsi . . . ecstasi*: in my thesis I wrongly referred these words to Tert.'s treatise *de ecstasi* (the same is done by Quispel, 17): Tert. only means to say that all these dreams are due to the 'ecstasy'. This kind of dreams is most in accordance with the Montanistic doctrine of ecstasy, cf. Adam, *Kirch. Tert.*, 139.

48. *The influence which time, the position of the body, and nourishment have on dreams.*

"It is presumed that the truest and clearest dreams occur towards the end of the night, and the most quiet ones in spring (§ 1). It is also recommended not to lie down supinely or on one's right side, lest the seat of the senses should be disturbed or the liver be pressed. But these are only ingenious suppositions, for we cannot assume that dreams may be influenced from without (§ 2). We must also pay attention to prescriptions about the abstaining from any or at least from some kinds of food, for instance the injunction to fast before the *incubatio*, or the avoidance of beans by the Pythagoreans. The improbability of the latter instruction is shown by the case of Daniel and of the three young men who only ate vegetables and yet received the gift of dreaming and of explaining dreams (§ 3). As to the abstaining from food, I myself found that, when I had not taken any, I did not remember afterwards to have had any dreams. However, I do not mean to imply that in these matters this abstemiousness, which is required by pagan superstition, is of no importance for the true faith. Thus Daniel for the time of three weeks took nothing but juiceless food; but he did so only to 'lure God to him' by humiliating himself, but not with the intention of making his soul specially pure and clear, as though it was not meant to pass through that ecstasy which constitutes the essence of all dreams. For it is impossible to neutralize this 'ecstasy' by practising abstemiousness; by doing so we can only cause the 'ecstasy', which will inevitably come over us, to take place in God <, i. e.: we can only effect that God sends us reasonable dreams > (§ 4)".

Of the materials worked up in this chapter the discussion of the influence of the position of the body on dreams may perhaps be traced back to Soranus, as is shown in the commentary on § 2 (however, it is also possible that Tert. found both a treatment of this question and the data discussed in § 1 in the dream-book of Hermippus; see Introduction, p. 44*). Daniel is mentioned in this connection, because his fasting was regarded by the Montanists as a prototype of their own practices.

All views mentioned in §§ 1/3 are combated, for according to Tert.

it is impossible that dreams are influenced from without (§ 2: *Alioquin . . . poterunt*; § 4: *Ita . . . fiat*).

1. *Certiora . . . somnari*: the accusatives have almost the function of adverbs as in Apul. *met.* 1, 18: *extrema somniasti . . . saeva et gravia somnare*. This adverbial use of the plural of neutral adjectives, which is much less common than the similar use of the sing., is found in poetry in particular from Lucr. 5, 33 downwards (Hofm., *Synt.*, 381); for instances from Tert.'s works, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 17 and Borleffs, *Mnemos.* N. S. 60 (1932), 89, e. g. *paen.* 6, 1: *incerta reptant* ('ἄδηλα ἔρπουσιν' Iunius). This use becomes very common in poetry of the last period, e. g. Iuvenc. 4, 313: *extrema iacere* ('to be dying'); 4, 194 *incauta furentem*; 4, 546; Avit. *carm.* 2, 132; 4, 133; Ennod. *carm.* 1, 5, 36; Sedul. *carm. Pasch.* 3, 330; Prud. *perist.* 14, 101; *apotheos.* 11; *Anthol. Lat.* 893, 1/2; for Corippus, cf. Petschenig's index, p. 232, for Amm. Marc., Hagendahl, *Stud. Amm.*, 45₁; cf. also Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 255; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 420/1 ('poetical, mostly a Grecism'); von Geisau, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 36 (1916), 88; Kraus, *Paulin. Nol.*, 79. — *colatiora* = *puriora*, cf. 9, 6. — *sub* has temporal sense (also in *apol.* 21, 6 and 35, 10), which is found from Caes. *b. gall.* 5, 13, 3 and *b. civ.* 1, 27, 3 downwards; cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 539; Rönsch, *It.*², 397; Svenn., *Oros.*, 48/9; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.* 1, 122. For *extimus* (earliest instances: Lucr. 3, 219 and Cic. *rep.* 6, 17), which is also found in *apol.* 21, 6 and *adv. Marc.* 3, 18 (406, 24), cf. Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 39/40. — It was a widely-spread belief that dreams seen towards the end of the night were the trustworthiest, e. g. Moschus 2, 5: (ἥώς) εὔτε καὶ ἀτρεκέων ποιμαίνεται ἔθνος ὀνείρων; Hor. *sat.* 1, 10, 33: *post mediam noctem . . . cum somnia vera*; Ovid. *heroid.* 19, 195/6; Prop. 4, 4, 62/6; C. E. L. 1109, 7; Cyprian. Gall. *Numeri* 281/4; Philostrat. *Vita Apollon.* 2, 37. The same view may perhaps be found in Ovid *met.* 15, 664: *somnique fugam lux alma secuta est* and Sen. *Troad.* 438 *seqq.*; for the interpretation of Verg. *Aen.* 6, 893/6 (when Aeneas leaves Hades through the gate of the false dreams, it means that he departs before midnight), cf. W. Everett, *Class. Rev.* 14 (1900), 153 *seq.*; Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 348 (who refers to *Aen.* 8, 26 ~ 67; cf. also *ib.* 5, 739). This belief also occurs in the *papyri magicae* (e. g. *Pap. Londin.* 121, 943: καὶ ὅψε ὥρα πέμπτη νυκτός; cf. Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 225), in medieval epics (Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 2^a, 959), and in the *Divina Commedia* (*Inf.* 26, 7: *ma se presso al mattin del ver si sogna*; *Purgat.* 9, 13/8). Similarly, the Indians regarded the last dream only as important (J. von Negelein, *Weltgeschichte des Aberglaubens*, 1, 320). On the other hand, the *diurnae quietis imagines* were considered to be fallacious (Apul. *met.* 4, 27). — *emergente*: cf. 53, 6. — *vigore*: cf. the note on 43, 2. — *producto*: this part. occurs for the first time in Tert.'s works (also in *paen.* 10, 2; *pud.* 8 (235, 1) and 9 (238, 26/7); *adv. Marc.* 5, 6 (589, 3); *apol.* 18, 3 (cf. Löfst., *Krit.*, 55); *res.* 11 = 40, 18); in later times it is found in Hier. *in Ion.* 4, 10/1; *ep. de cast.* 4, 6 (p. 129 Caspari): *in vanum producta (proiecta) S) est castitas*. — *verno* = *vere*. In the ablat. this

use of the adj. is frequently found from Cato *agric.* 54, 3 downwards (cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 457; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 42 and *Per.*, 297); in the other cases, with the exception of the accus., it is rarely found in Latin of the later period. The dative occurs in *spect.* 9 (11, 18), the plural *verna* in *res.* 12 (41, 7; also Cypr. *ad Demetr.* 3 (353, 1 H.) and Ennod. *c. Epiphan.*, *praej.*). *hibernum* = *hiems* is found in *apol.* 40, 14 and *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (291, 12). A mascul. subst. *vernus* occurs in [Hippocr.] *ep. ad Antioch. reg.* (ed. by A. Nelsson, *Symb. Danielsson*, 215, 17). — *magis quieta*: on the other hand, Augustus dreamt *plurima . . . et vana et irrita* in spring (Suet. *Aug.* 91). — *hiems . . . obduret*: cf. Soran. *gynaec.* 1, 41, 2: ἐν . . . τῷ χειμῶνι πεπυκνωμένων τῶν σωμάτων; Cael. Aurel. *acut. morb.* 3, 5, 53: *quod corpora denset* (sc. *hiems*); *id.*, *morb. chron.* 3, 8, 110. — *autumnus . . . valetudinum*: Hor. *carm.* 3, 23, 8: *grave tempus*; *sat.* 2, 6, 19; Liv. 25, 26, etc. (Thes. l. L. II: 1603, 63 *seqq.*); from medical literature, cf. e. g. Cels. 2, 1; Soran. *gynaec.* 1, 10, 41; 2, 48 (117), 1. — *alias* = *alioquin*; see the note on 46, 8. — About dreams dreamt in autumn, cf. Alciphron *ep.* 3, 10: ἀνεγειρόμενος περιχαρῆς ἦν, ἐνθύμιον δὲ ποιησάμενος τοὺς πολλοχόους ἐστάναι μῆνας ἔγνων εἶναι τὰ ἐνύπνια ψευδέστατα; Plut. *quaest. conviv.* 8, 10, 1: τὸ λεγόμενον περὶ τῶν ἐνυπνίων ὥς ἐστιν ἀβέβαια καὶ ψευδῆ μάλιστα περὶ τοὺς πολλοχόους; Basil. *ep. class.* 2, *ep.* 207, 1 (P. G. 32, 761 A). — *vinosissimis*: for *vinosus* as a property of some kinds of fruit, cf. Suet. *Aug.* 77; Plin. *n. h.* 15, 97, 109; Colum. *de arbor.* 23, 1; Cael. Aurel. *morb. chron.* 1, 4, 93. Plutarch (*quaest. conviv.* 8, 10) asserts that the use of fruit and wine in autumn causes confused dreams (cf. also Philostratus *Vita Apollon.* 2, 37). Probably Tert. in this passage altered the note found in his source under the influence of his adherence to the Montanists, who rejected juicy fruits as too luxurious; cf. for this view in particular *iei.* 1 (275, 4/6): *quod etiam xerophagias observemus siccantes cibum ab omni carne et omni iurulentia et uvidioribus quibusque pomis nec quid vinositatis vel edamus vel potemus*; J. Schümmer, *Die altchristl. Fastenpraxis*, 39/40.

2. The words *ex ipsius quietis situ* (sc. *magis quieta somniari*) are on a level with the preceding *ex temporibus . . . anni*; the structure of the sentence is less clear, because here a subordinate clause (*si . . . decumbat*) follows instead of a subst. (*verno* § 1). — *resupina*: the interpretation of this adj. is not absolutely certain; we must either regard *quies* as the subject of *decumbat* or once more interpret *resupina* as an adverbial accus. and supply *ille qui dormit* as the subject of *decumbat*. The latter interpretation is preferable, cf. e. g. Cic. *invent.* 1, 98 *vitare poterit* (where the subject *orator* should be supplied from the context) or Ovid *ars amat.* 3, 787/8: *Mille modi Veneris: simplex minimique laboris, / cum iacet in dextrum semisupina latus* (in technical treatises this use of the third person of the singular is very common, cf. e. g. Keil's notes on Cato *agric.* 11, 2 and Varro *r. r.* 1, 2, 21; Kroll, *Glotta* 5 (1914), 361; Löfst., *Per.*, 44/5; Hofm., *Synt.*, 623). — *neque e. . . mentis*: this sentence contains nothing new, but only serves to explain

the preceding prescription: if one lies down on one's back, the intestines are 'also inclined backwards', if on one's right side, the liver is pressed (according to ancient physicians, the liver is entirely at the right side of the body, cf. e. g. Arist. *de gener. animal.* 4, 4 = 771a 8/9; [Clem.] *recogn.* 8, 30). Instead of *neque* (before *conresupinatis*) Tert. might also have written *ne*. — *conresupinatis*: ἀ. λ., of course due to the preceding *resupina*. — *quasi . . . loculis*: it seems impossible to retain the reading given by A: *quasi repulsis, localis*. After *conresupinatis* it is not at all necessary to introduce *repulsis* by *quasi*; on the other hand, this word is not superfluous if we read *refusis*, this verb being used metaphorically. In a similar context *refundere* is used by Celsus 7, 16. Celsus discusses wounds in the belly, through which the intestines are pushed outside the body; in this case the patient should be put down on his back (this fact, too, furnishes a parallel to the passage under discussion), after which *si angustius vulnus est, quam ut intestina commodè refundantur, incidendum est, donec satis pateat*. In the present passage *refundere* is in perfect accordance with the subsequent *fluitet*; cf. also *res.* 4 (30, 23): *pulmonibus natandum* (sc. *erit, halandum* Engelbrecht Kroym., but cf. my interpretation of this expression in *Mnemos.*, III. ser. 3 (1936), 165/6). — Instead of *loculis* (Gel.) A B have *localis*. As an attribute of *statio sensuum* this adjective is quite superfluous; the expression *statio sensuum* is also used by Cael. Aurel. (*acut. morb.* 2, 9, 51), so that it may be supposed that a Greek equivalent of it was already used by Soranus (of course we need not infer from this supposition that Soranus used these words in exactly the same context). Moreover, the reading *loculis* makes the use of *quasi* easy to explain: Tert. describes the intestines as 'a kind of depositories <of food>'; (*loculus* is used 11, 5; *cult. fem.* 1, 9, 3; *exh. cast.* 12, 3/4). The choice of this word may be due to Plato *Tim.* 70 E, where the liver is described as φάτιν η . . . τῇ τοῦ σώματος τροφῇ (cf. also Arist. *de part. anim.* 2, 3 (650a 17 *seqq.*): οὕτω καὶ ἄλλας ἀρχὰς δεῖ πλείους εἶναι, δι' ὧν ἅπαν λήψεται τὸ σῶμα τὴν τροφήν, ὥσπερ ἐκ φάτιν ης, ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐντέρων φύσεως). The *statio sensuum* is of course the heart, to which, according to the Stoic view (shared by Tert.) συντείνει τὰ αἰσθητήρια πάντα (*St. V. F.* 2, 896; cf. 15, 5). Hoppe (*Synt.*, 187) interprets 'das Pericardium', but in ch. 15 Tert. continually mentions the heart itself. — *compressa . . . mentis*: the traditional reading *aut compressa* (*compressu* Gel.) *iecoris sagina* (*angina* B) *sit mentis* must be corrupt. The parallelism of the sentences clearly shows that Tert. means the lying down on the right side, which causes pressure on the liver. The question is what to do with the words *sagina sit mentis*. *Sagina* occurs fairly often in writings belonging to Tert.'s later period, especially in *de ieiunio*, where the Montanistic practice of fasting is upheld against the 'gluttony' of the *psychici*; cf. *iei.* 6 (280, 3): *ipsa natura enuntiabit, quales nos ante pabulum et potum in virgine adhuc saliva exhibere consuerit rebus dumtaxat sensu agendis, quo divina tractantur, si multo pollentioris mentis, si multo vivacioris cordis, quam cum totum illud domicilium interioris hominis*

escis stipatum, vinis inundatum, decoquendis iam stercorebus exaestuans praemeditatorium efficitur latrinarum... per illam (edacitatis enormitatem)... incrassatum erat cor populi, ne oculis videret et auribus audiret et corde coniceret adipibus obstructo, quas nominatim esui abstulit dedocens hominem saginae studere. From this quotation it is evident that *sagina* should be retained. We can try to connect this word with the genit. *mentis* and translate: "lest by a pressure on the liver a fattening (i. e. blunting?; cf. the words *corde... adipibus obstructo* in the preceding quotation) of the mind should take place"; but apart from the fact that this is a most unnatural interpretation, we are also forced (unless we accept Gelenius' conjecture *compressu*) to suppose the existence of a subst. *compressa* equivalent to *compressus* (-io). Now, though in one passage Tert. has *remissa* (*adv. Marc.* 4, 18 = 480, 13), and though it is possible that he wished to avoid *compressus* and -io, because these words mostly mean 'cohabitation' (*adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (535, 4); *Thes.* I. L. III: 2157, 2/9 and 47/53), it must be pointed out that such substantives are usually only found in the last period of the Latin language (*perdita* = -io perhaps in *Commod. instr.* 2, 28, 10; *ascensa* in *sacram. Leonin.* 313 (*ib.* 314 -io); *sacram. Gelas.* I, 63 *tit.*; I, 65 *tit.*; *missa, collecta*). It is far more probable that we should connect the genit. *iecoris* with *sagina* and translate: 'the fat liver'; in Plato *Tim.* 71 B the liver is qualified as πυκνὸν καὶ λεῖον καὶ λαμπρόν (it should not be forgotten that Plato is quoted in the next sentence, where Tert. certainly refers to this passage). This being established, the question remains whether the words *compressa iecoris sagina* are to be interpreted as an *ablat. absol.* or as a *nomin.* The first possibility finds support in the parallelism of the sentences, for in this case *compressa iecoris sagina* corresponds with *conresupinatis internis*, and *sensuum* with *mentis* (*mentis* of course refers to ἡ περὶ τὸ ἥπαρ ψυχῆς μοῖρα κατεκτισμένη (*Tim.* 71 D), which, according to Plato, contains the seat of the μαντικόν). If this interpretation is right, it is clear that after *sagina* something must have dropped out. From the artificial order of the words (*sit mentis*) it is evident that Tert. wanted to have a correct *clausula* here. To get *clausula* I, we need a word ending in a trochee before *sit*; hence it may be supposed that we must insert *sedes* or a similar feminine subst., the *clausula* requiring a participle ending in -ā. The alternative is that *compressa iecoris sagina* is a *nominative* and corresponds with *statio sensuum fluitet*. In this case we must needs excise *mentis* without being able to explain its insertion into the text. Moreover, it would be rather surprising, if a special reason were given for the restless motion of the seat of the senses (viz. *conresupinatis internis*), but not for the pressure on the liver; so the former solution seems to be preferable. — As already observed, Tert. here refers to the famous passage from Plato's *Timaeus* (70 D/72 D) in which the significance of the liver as regards the origin of prophetic dreams is discussed; from this passage it is easy to understand that a pressure on the liver must have a bad effect on dreams. On the other hand, Plato does not connect the nature of dreams with the position of the body during sleep. It

is not impossible that it was Soranus who did so, firstly because Diocles, who is often cited by Soranus, had dealt with this subject (see the next note), secondly because Soranus discussed the effect of a liver-complaint on the position of the body during sleep (cf. Cael. Aurel. *morb. chron.* 3, 4, 51; however, it is equally plausible that this subject, too, was discussed in the dream-book of Hermippus. — For the effect of a supine position on sleep or dream, cf. Theophrast. Π. κόπων 16 (3, 135 Wimmer): *κατάκεινται δ' ὑπτιοὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκλυσιν* · ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ σχήματι μάλιστα ἄνισον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐξονειρωγμὸν (= *emissionem seminis per quietem*) συνέργει and Diocles frag. 141 Wellm.: ὑπτίον δὲ καθεύδειν οὐδενὶ βέλτιόν ἐστιν · δύσπνοια γὰρ καὶ πνιγμοὶ καὶ ἐπιληπτικά καὶ ἐξονειριασμοὶ (= ἐξονειρωγμοὶ) μάλιστα συμβαίνουνσι τοῖς οὕτω καθεύδουσιν; Plin. *n. h.* 28, 54: *Aristoteles et Fabianus . . . magis* (sc. *somniari*) . . . *supino cubitu, at prono nihil*. At any rate, physicians seem to have assumed that people lying down on their backs were apt to get confused dreams; as for the position on the right side, we may perhaps refer to Diocles, *loc. cit.*: *κεκλίσθαι δὲ παντὶ βέλτιόν ἐστι, ὄντος μὲν ἔτι περὶ τὴν γαστέρα τοῦ πληρώματος, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀριστερὰν πλευράν, λαπαρᾶς δὲ γενομένης μεταβάλλειν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν δεξίαν*. It is very remarkable that with regard to the position on the right side popular belief seems to have held the opposite view; cf. the prescription of the great Berlin payrus (150, 23 Parthey): *κοιμῶ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεξιοῦ πλευροῦ χαμαὶ τε καὶ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ*. It seems probable that a pressure on the heart was generally regarded as particularly unfavourable to dreaming. Cf. also [Arist.] *problem.* 3, 5 (886a 3 *seqq.*): *Διὰ τί ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ κατακειμένοις μᾶλλον ἐπέρχεται ὕπνος* (the alternative is: ἢ ὅτι ἀκίνησία ὁ ὕπνος; τὰ οὖν κινητικὰ μέρη δεῖ ἡρεμεῖν, τὰ δὲ δεξιὰ κινητικὰ. οὕτω δὲ κατακειμένων οἷον δέδεται ἀρχὴ τις ἐπεγερτικὴ) and *ib.* 3, 7 (886a 15 *seqq.*): *Διὰ τί κατακειμένα μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀριστερὰ ἡδέως, καθεύδομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ μᾶλλον* (in these discussions dreams are not referred to). — *aestimavit*, not *probat*, cf. the note on 9, 3, *aestimationem*. — *etsi Plato est*, etc.: this only holds good for the latter part of § 2; for similar errors in Tert.'s writings, cf. the notes on 46, 5 and 49, 3. For *fortasseam*, cf. 5, 1. — *ex arbitrio*: which, according to 45, 4/6 and 47, 3, is impossible. — *si . . . poterunt* after *alioquin* is a pleonasm, cf. 29, 2.

3. *derogandis*: cf. 38, 3. — *ieiunium indicitur*: this is the technical term from Hor. *sat.* 2, 3, 291 down to Eugipp. *Vit. Sever.* 18, 2. For the practice of fasting before the *incubatio*, cf. the materials collected by L. Deubner, *De incubatione* (Berlin 1906), 14/7; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 236/8 (§§ 849/54); Arbesmann, 101/2; for the similar Christian view, cf. Weinle, 224 *seq.*; Dibelius, note on *Hermas vis.* 3, 1, 1 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 454). — *ut castimoniam inducat*: *castimonia* has almost become a technical term for the abstaining from certain kinds of food (Arbesmann, 13), cf. e. g. *iei.* 2 (275, 31 *sqq.*): *quales castimoniae Apim, Isidem et Magnam Matrem certorum eduliorum exceptione purificant*; Apul. *met.* 11, 30: *inanimae . . . castimoniae*. — *speciem*: cf. the note on 25, 1. — *fabam*: this refers to the well-known

instruction of the ancient Pythagoreans κυάμων ἀπέχου (Jamblich. *Protrept.* 21 λζ'); cf. Arbesmann, 53/8 (literature on this subject *ib.*, 53₁) and Hopfner, *loc. cit.*, 1, 49 (§ 208); 134/6 (§§ 529/32); 234 (§ 839). In connection with dreams: Cic. *divin.* 2, 58, 119: *Iam Pythagoras et Plato, locupletissimi auctores, quo in somnis certiora videamus, praeparatos quodam cultu atque victu proficisci ad dormiendum iubent. Faba quidem Pythagorei utique abstinere, quasi vero eo cibo mens, non venter infletur*; *ib.* 1, 30, 62; Plut. *quaest. conviv.* 734 E; Clem. Alex. *strom.* 3, 3, 24, 2; cf. also *Geopon.* 2, 35, 3 *seq.*: Οἱ δὲ φυσικοί φασὶ τοὺς κυάμους ἀμβλύνειν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἐσθιόντων αὐτοὺς· διὸ καὶ ἐμποδίζειν ταῖς εὐθυονερίαις νομίζονται, εἰσι γὰρ πνευματώδεις; Dioscurides *med.* 2, 127: Κύαμος Ἑλληνικὸς πνευματώδης, φουσώδης, δύσπεπτος, δυσόνειρος. Dreams about beans are a bad sign according to Artemidor. *Onirocrit.* 1, 68. Already Aristotle (*de somniis* 3 = 461a 23/5) points out that especially πάθη πνευματώδη make dreams confused. Since Caelius Aurelianus often mentions *inflabiles cibi* (e. g. *acut. morb.* 2, 40, 233; 3, 8, 95; 3, 17, 164), it is possible that this remark must be traced back to Soranus; however, it may seem preferable to take into account an influence of 'miracle-books' through the intermediary of Hermippus (see Introduction, p. 47*), for in Apollon. *mirab.* 46 we read: ὁθεν καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν (T.: *ob hanc quoque speciem*), ταχὰ δὲ καὶ δι' ἄλλας οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἀπηγορεύκασιν τῷ κυάμῳ χρῆσθαι. καὶ γὰρ πνευματοποιὸν (*inflatui*) καὶ δύσπεπτον (*onerosum*), καὶ τοὺς ὀνείρους τετραγαμένους ἡμῖν ἐμποεῖ. — *onerosum et inflatui pabulum*: the *dativus finalis* should certainly be retained (as is also evident from the clausula). The datives quoted by Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 2, 57₁ (3, 60) and Hoppe, *Synt.*, 27 have a somewhat different character; the same is to be said about such passages as Cato *de agric.* 5, 3: *satui semen* (for which cf. Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 164/5; Hofm., *Synt.*, 418; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 223; Schöndorffer, 14) or Cic. *Phil.* 13, 15: *receptui signum*. Better parallels are found in Varro *r. r.* 1, 2, 18: *quaedam enim pecudes culturae sunt inimicae ac veneno*; Tac. *hist.* 2, 1: (*imperium*) *quod . . . ipsis principibus prosperum vel exitio fuit*; *ib.* 3, 5: *ut transmittere in Italiam impune et usui foret*; here the dative is equivalent to an adj., but forms part of the predicate. An attributive use of such a dative, as is found in the present passage, occurs in Apul. *flor.* 14 (18, 12/3 Helm): (Crates) *rem familiarem abicit velut onus stercoris magis labori quam usui*; cf. also the dat. *frugi*, which has completely passed into an adj. (Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 295). For the adj. *inflativus*, see Svenn., *Oribas.*, 89. — *trina*: in the sense of *triplex* this adj. occurs from Statius downwards (Chrüzander, 66). — *fraternitas . . . contenti*: for the *constructio ad sensum*, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 92; *Beitr.*, 49; *Tert.*, 14. Similarly, *scorp.* 8 (161, 8/10): *trina fraternitas . . . non ignoraverunt*; Cypr. *ep.* 8, 2 and 14, 4. A concrete sense of *fraternitas* is also found in *iei.* 7 (283, 12); *pud.* 7 (233, 26); *c. Chr.* 7, 81. The fasting of Daniel and his friends was regarded as the prototype of the *xerophagia* of the Montanists, cf. *iei.* 7 (283, 8 *seqq.*): *aspice Danielis exemplum. circa somnium regis Babylonis omnes turbantur sophistae, negant ultra de praestantia humana posse*

cognosci. solus Daniel deo fidens et sciens, quid ad demerendam dei gratiam faceret, spatium tridui postulat, cum sua fraternitate ieiunat, atque ita orationibus commendatis (cf. in this chapter § 4: *ad ipsam ecstasin commendandam*) *et ordinem et significationem somnii per omnia instruitur*; cf. *ib.* 9 (284, 18/23). For Daniel, cf. also Hippolyt. *comm. in Dan.* 1, 11, 2.

4. The mentioning of Daniel and his friends leads Tert. to an exposition of the Montanistic view on the obtaining of revelations. According to the Montanists, revelations might even be 'extorted' from God by fasting, cf. *iei.* 12 (290, 10/1): *revelationum . . . quae xerophagiis extorqueantur* (it is from this point of view that the words of Dinocrates in *Pass. Perpet.* 4, 1 should be interpreted); in the same way, Daniel fasted *ut deum illiceret humiliationis officiis*. In this respect Tert., too, adheres to the common opinion about the importance of fasting as a preparation for ecstasy, but he combats the view that fasting also clears the mind and so makes it fit for the obtaining of revelations, for the essence of dream is constituted by ecstasy (45, 3), and this rule has no exception. Thus fasting can only 'recommend the ecstasy to God', in other words, it can achieve that God concerns himself with the ecstasy, of course in the first place by sending prophetic dreams; it is never able to neutralize the ecstasy itself. — *ieiunus . . . sentiam*: an appeal to the *sensus communis*, as is also found in 43, 2: *Ego me nunquam ita dormisse praesumo, ut ex his aliquid agnoscam*. — *ad hanc partem = ad hanc speciem*, cf. 25, 1. — *superstitionem . . . religionem*: cf. *orat.* 15 (189, 18/9). — *daemonia* refers to the pagan gods in the first place, for Tert. is thinking of the pagan practices of fasting used at the *incubatio* (see the note on § 3). — *ad lenocinium divinitatis*, i. e. "ut sibi speciem divinitatis concilient". For the word *lenocinium*, cf. *praescr.* 41, 9, for the conception underlying it, the *comm.* on 20, 5 and 46, 12. Cf. also Tatian. *orat.* 12 (13, 22/3 Schwartz): *ἀγασταὶ θεότητος γενέσθαι προὔθυμήθησαν* (sc. οἱ δαίμονες). — *familiarē*: here this adj. seems to have a causative force (of which no other instances are known): "quia hominem familiarem dei reddit". We may also interpret the present passage in this way that the *sobrietas* itself is *familiaris dei*, but the former possibility is much more probable, cf. *iei.* 6 (281, 19/21): *tanta est circumscripti victus praerogativa, ut deum praestet homini contubernalem, parem revera pari*; *ib.* (281, 25/6). For *familiaris*, cf. *ib.* (281, 14/7): (*Helias*) *et ipse quadraginta diebus et noctibus vacuo ventre, arido ore pervenit in montem Choreb, ubi cum in speluncam devertisset, quam familiari congressu dei exceptus est*. In *fuga* 2, 7 Christians are qualified as *domestici dei*. For further particulars, cf. E. Peterson, *Der Gottesfreund*, *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 1923, 161 *seqq.* — *statione*: it is only in the present passage and in *iei.* 10 (288, 18) that this word is equivalent to *ieiunium* (cf. J. Schümmer, *Altchristl. Fastenpraxis*, 82 and 236/40). The development of the sense of *statio* has not yet been explained satisfactorily; cf. A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 34/6 ("eine christlich-militärische Funktion"; in refutation of this view Sainio (119) rightly

points out that the idea of a *militia Christi* has never been more than a simile used in literature); Teeuwen, 117 ('assembly for the purpose of divine service (σύναξις)' > 'the service itself (originally without communion)' > 'divine service and fasting' > 'fasting'); Svennung, *Statio* = "*Fasten*", Z N T W 32 (1933), 294/308 (combats Teeuwen's view); Schümmer, *op. cit.*, 123/50 (starts from the expression *stationem cepi*, i. e. "I chose a place for prayer"; cf., however, Senn., *Pallad.*, 650); Senn., *Pallad.*, 608₁; Sainio, 86/90; K. Holl, *Gesamm. Schr.*, 2, 213. — **aruit victu**, i. e. ἐξηροφάγησεν; cf. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 84; Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 77; *apol.* 40, 15: *ieiuniis aridi*. Cf. the quotation of Dan. 10, 2/3 in *iei.* 9 (284, 27/9): *in illis, inquit, diebus ego Daniel eram lueus per tres hebdomadas, panem suavem non edi, caro et vinum non introierunt in os meum, oleo unctus non sum.* — **ut . . . officiis**: cf. *iei.* 12 (290, 10/1); *ib.* 9 (285, 2/4): *ita xerophagiarum miseratio et humiliatio metum expellunt et aures dei advertunt (∞ familiarem dei) et occultorum compotes faciunt*. For the use of *sed*, cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 44 and Waltz., *Ét.*, 184. — **ut . . . strueret**: as was the aim of pagan incubatores. *Animae* may be a genit., cf. the notes on 5, 1 and 6, 3. — **quasi . . . acturae**: the right explanation of these words was given by Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 84): "d. i. *quasi sine ecstasi acturae*, führt nur das vorausgehende *ut . . . strueret* näher aus". — **commendandum**: *exh. cast.* 10, 13/4: *ideo apostolus temporalem purificationem orationum commendandarum causa adiecit*; *adv. Marc.* 3, 18 (407, 18); *pat.* 13 (20, 12/3); *orat.* 17 (190, 22/3).

49. *The rule that everybody has dreams, is without exceptions.*

"Those who assert that little children do not dream, are confuted by the facts (§ 1). And when Herodotus says that the *Atlantes* in Libya never dream (which is regarded as an unfavourable testimony to their mental constitution), either rumour has lied to him, or in those countries there are many demons who make dreaming impossible; a similar account is given by Aristotle about a demigod buried in Sardinia. Perhaps the cases of Nero and Thrasymedes may be explained in the same way (§ 2). However, it is highly improbable that even God should be unable to send dreams to these *Atlantes*; so we may suppose that, as already said, either rumour lied or, if this is true, this fact is due to demons. But nobody should think that there should be any human soul naturally unable to dream (§ 3)".

It is highly probable that the contents of this chapter hark back to the dream-book of Hermippus. The following arguments may be advanced: 1) Artemidor. *onirocrit.* 4, 63 (241, 1/2 Hercher) shows that this subject came up for discussion in dream-books in general: εὔ γάρ ἴσθι ὅτι ἐνίους οὐδαμῶς ἐνδέχεται ἰδεῖν ὀνείρους; 2) The quotation from Herodotus in § 2 points this way (see the note on 46, 4); 3) The note from Aristotle in § 2 is of the same kind as the note on Saturn in 46, 10, which was almost certainly borrowed from Hermippus. As for the notes on Nero and Thrasymedes, see the preface to ch. 44.

The polemic part of the chapter is evidently due to the wish to establish the dream as a source for the knowledge of God given to all men (cf. 47, 2); hence Tert. arrives at the conclusion that the inability to dream (just as in 44, 2 the long sleep of Epimenides) is a *vitium animae*, which by no means can belong to the nature of the soul.

1. *quī*: this pronoun refers to Aristotle, cf. *hist. anim.* 4, 10 (537b 14/20): καὶ νέοις μὲν οὔσι καὶ παιδίοις ἔτι πάμπαν οὐ γίγνεται ἐνύπνιον, ἀλλ' ἄρχεται τοῖς πλείστοις περὶ τέτταρα ἔτη ἢ πέντε (next he discusses the more general problem: ἤδη δὲ γεγόνاسι καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες οἱ ὅλως οὐδὲν πώποτε ἐνύπνιον εἶδον. συνέβη δὲ τισι τῶν τοιούτων προϊούσης τῆς ἡλικίας ἰδεῖν ἐνύπνιον, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γενέσθαι περὶ τὸ σῶμα μεταβολὴν τοῖς μὲν εἰς θάνατον τοῖς δ' εἰς ἀρρωστίαν); *de insomn.* 3 (461a 11/4): διὸ καὶ μετὰ τὴν τροφήν καὶ πάμπαν νέοις οὔσιν, οἷον τοῖς παιδίοις, οὐ γίγνεται ἐνύπνια· πολλὴ γὰρ ἡ κίνησις διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς θερμότητα. A different view is given in *hist. anim.* 7, 10 (587b 10/1): καὶ ἐνύπνια ζόμενον δῆλον μὲν γίγνεται (sc. τὸ παῖδιον), μνημονεύει δ' ὅψε τὰς φαντασίας; cf. also Plin. *n. h.* 10, 211: *somniat statim infans; nam et pavore expurgiscitur et suctum imitatur* (this passage seems to have been unknown to Tert., otherwise he would also have referred to the latter part of it). — *animae*: a *dat. auctoris*, cf. 6, 4. — *expungantur*: cf. 22, 1. — *succussus* is an archaism (Pacuv. *trag.* 257, Apul. *met.* 1, 13 (conject.) and 3, 21); the plural occurs in the present passage only. *renidentia* (ἀ. λ.) is a poetic word, just as *renidere* (Hagendahl, *Ammian.*, 65). Perhaps this remark too should be traced back to a passage from Aristotle, viz. *de generat. animal.* 5, 1 (779a 11/2): καὶ ἐγρηγορότα μὲν οὐ γελᾷ τὰ παῖδια, καθεύδοντα δὲ καὶ δακρύει καὶ γελᾷ. — *ut . . . comprehendant*: cf. the comm. on 2, 1 (*sensus communis*) and 25, 3. — *motus . . . somniantis*: of these motions Tert. had formed a very concrete idea, as is evident from the description given in 45, 1/2; cf. also 9, 8. The choice of the expression (*animae somniantis*) is partly due to the fact that, according to Tert., the soul in itself, the *natura animae*, should on no account be regarded as incapable of dreaming. — *erumpere*: cf. 41, 3.

2. *Atlantes*: Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 39/40) proposes to read *Atlantica*, because A has *atlantico*, B *Athlantico*; it seems, however, more probable that the *o* is due to the words *caeco somno*, and the ending *-ic-* to the preceding *Libyca*. This note has been taken from Hdt. 4, 184: λέγονται δὲ (viz. οἱ Ἀτλαντες) . . . οὔτε ἐνύπνια ὄρα, just as Plin. (whose work Tert. does not use here; cf. the preface to this chapter) *n. h.* 5, 45; cf. Pietschmann, *R. E.* II, 2107. — *caeco somno transigere* (A) is the correct reading. It is quite unnecessary to insert *noctem* (Gel.), for in the present passage *transigere* is synonymous to *degere*, which is frequently followed by a similar ablat.; cf. *Thes. l. L.* V 1: 385, 27 *seqq.*, e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 4, 89: *gens felix . . . annoso degit aevo*; Dracont. *Romul.* 10, 250: *caelibe vita degere* (add Plin. *n. h.* 9, 1: (*animalia*

terrestria) *hominum quadam consortione degentia*; Boëth. *consol. philos.* 5, 6, 2: *cunctorum ratione degentium*). The editorial staff of the *Thes. l. l.* kindly informed me that this use of *transigere* in the sense of *vivere* occurs in some passages from the works of very late authors, viz. Cassiodor. *institut.* 32 (1147 C): *si concorditer et spiritualiter . . . transigitis*; *Var.* 11, 8, 2: *-ite semper innoxii*; [Boëth.] *de fide cathol.* 147 (p. 180 Peiper); *Descr. orb. terrae* (edited by Th. Sinko, A. L. L. 13, 543/71) 8: *et ipsi sine imperio- unt bene*; *ib.* 10; 16; 22; *serm. Arian.* frag. II, 11. Cf. also Venant. Fortun. *carm.* 9, 2, 87: *quod trahimus nascendo, sine hoc non -it ullus*. — *animae . . . taxantur*: it is certainly wrong to follow Kroymann and Reifferscheid in inserting *non*, as was rightly pointed out by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 2, 40). Tert. regards the view that certain classes of men should be incapable of dreaming as an insult to the nature of the soul in general, and wishes to confute it by every means in his power; this is evident (apart from the excited tone) from the last words of the chapter, especially from *dum ne*: “provided that <under no circumstance> . . .”. We also must agree with Thörnell that *taxare* here is synonymous to *perstringere*, but we need not follow him in adopting Gelenius’ conjecture *taxatur*. Of eight passages quoted by Thörnell no less than four give *taxare* connected with a personal object in the sense of *onerare* (cf. 40, 4) or even of *inurere* (cf. the comm. on 20, 3), viz. *praescr.* 6, 5 *seqq.*: *sed et in omni paene epistula de adulterinis doctrinis fugiendis inculcans haereses taxat* (viz. Paulus); *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (617, 18 *seqq.*): *pseudoapostolos . . . conversationis, non praedicationis adulteratae reos taxat*; *ib.* 5, 18 (642, 22) and 19 (646, 10). *Natura* must be interpreted as an *ablat. limitationis*. — *Herodoto*: we do not find the name where we should have expected it; cf. 28, 2. — *nonnunquam . . . calumniosa*: Tert. protects the *barbari* against rumour; cf. the note on 6, 7. *calumniosus* seems to be a technical term of the Jct (e. g. *Gai. dig.* 2, 1, 11, 1); usually Tert. prefers *contumeliosus* (cf. Thörn., *St. Tert.*, 4, 124). For the use of *in*, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 40. — *eiusmodi* can only be explained from the context: *eiusmodi daemonum* = *d. qui somnia impediunt*; cf. the note on 34, 2. — *Aristoteles*: this account harks back to *phys.* 4, 11 (218b 21 *seqq.*): *εταν μηδέν αὐτοὶ μεταβάλλωμεν τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ λάθωμεν μεταβάλλοντες, οὐ δοκεῖ ἡμῖν γεγονέναι χρόνος, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἐν Σαρδοῖ μυθολογουμένοις καθεύδειν παρὰ τοῖς ἥρωσιν εταν ἐγερθῶσιν συνάπτουσι γάρ τὸ πρότερον νῦν τῷ ὕστερον νῦν καὶ ἐν ποιούσιν, ἐξαιροῦντες διὰ τὴν ἀναισθησίαν τὸ μεταξύ*. This passage was discussed in detail by Rohde, *Kl. Schr.*, 2, 197/208; we shall first give the contents of this discussion. Philoponus observes (*comm. in Arist.* IV, 388 b, 4/7 Brandis): *ἐλέγοντό τινες ἀρρωστοῦντες ἀπιέναι πρὸς τοὺς ἥρωας ἐν Σαρδοῖ καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι, ἀπιόντας δὲ κοιμᾶσθαι ἐφεξῆς δύο ἡμέρας, εἴτα ἐξυπνιζομένους νομίζειν, ἐκείνην εἶναι τὴν ὥραν καθ’ ἣν ἐπέστησαν τοῖς ἥρωσιν*; it is clear that he is thinking of *incubatio*. More is found in Simplicius (*loc. cit.*, 388a 25 *seqq.*; I quote the more complete text used by Rohde, *op. cit.*, 198): *ἐννέα γάρ τῶν Ἡρακλεῖ γεγονότων παίδων ἐκ τῶν Θεστίου τοῦ Θεσπιέως θυγατέρων ἐν Σαρδοῖ τελευτησάντων, ἔλεγον ἕως Ἀριστοτέλους, τάχα δὲ*

καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ ἐξηγητοῦ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους ἀσηπτά τε καὶ ὁλόκληρα διαμένειν τὰ σώματα καὶ φαντασίαν καθευδόντων παρεχόμενα. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν Σαρδοῖ ἥρωες οὗτοι. παρὰ τούτοις δὲ ὀνείρων ἔνεκεν ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς χρείας, εἰκὸς ἦν συμβολικῶς τινας μακροτέρους καθεύδειν ὕπνους. In the text of Aristotle there can be no question of *incubatio*; but it is quite possible that in Sardinia this custom existed, and that Philoponus alludes to it (Rohde, 203); we may compare the revelations sent by the sleeping Kronos (Plut. *de facie in orbe lunae* 26). It is certain that Tert. is referring to the passage from Aristotle (though he did not study it at first hand); the fact that he mentions only one demigod may be due to carelessness (Rohde, 205; cf. 46, 5), though it is also possible that he is thinking of Iolaos, the mythical founder of Olbia (*ib.*, 205₁). His account of the *incubatores* who are deprived of dreams may be explained in this way (*ib.*, 205) that he combined the quotation from Aristotle and the words of his interpreters by taking from the latter the note that people came to the demigods ὀνείρων ἔνεκεν and by connecting this with Aristotle's words διὰ τὴν ἀναισθησίαν (which however, as we have seen, have nothing to do with *incubatio*). According to Rohde, it is more probable that this account was transmitted to Tert. by Soranus rather than by Hermippus, as in the next sentence Nero and Thrasymedes are mentioned, whose names in ch. 44 occur immediately following a quotation from Soranus about the *incubo*. A further support for this view is found by Rohde in the circumstance that in *de an.* Tert. usually mentions Aristotle in chapters which certainly hark back to Soranus, viz. ch. 12, 14, and 43 (*op. cit.*, 208). At all events, he regards it as certain that Tert.'s authority consulted the text of Aristotle together with a commentary (probably that by Aspasia orAdrastus), which contained similar data as are found at a later time in Alex. Aphrodis. and Simplicius.

In opposition to this view we must observe in the first place that it is by no means probable that the notes on Nero and Thrasymedes could be found in Soranus (see the preface to ch. 44). Further, it is not right to put this quotation from Aristotle on a level with the short notes in ch. 12, 14, and 43, which were taken from doxographical literature; we must compare it to the note on Saturn in 46, 10, the source of which, as we have seen, was a collection of θαυμάσια. Hence we may draw the conclusion that this account was also taken from a miracle-book, either by Hermippus (which is much more probable) or by Tert. himself (see the Introduction, p. 47*). — *notat* is, of course, to be interpreted in the same way as the preceding *taxantur*. — *incubator* usually denotes the unlawful possessor (*Cod. Theodos.* 16, 10, 20; Macrobi. *somn. Scip.* 1, 10, 16; Serv. in *Aen.* 7, 266). Tert. owes the word to his knowledge of law and modifies the sense arbitrarily. — *tam . . . inferre*: Tert. may be thinking in particular of Mercury (by him regarded as a demon), who *dat somnos adimitque* (Verg. *Aen.* 4, 244); in 53, 6 he mentions the *Mercurius poetarum* as *evocator animarum*. — *Neronis . . . Thrasymedis*: see the preface to ch. 44.

3. **et a deo**: cf. 47, 2; for *a deo*, cf. 47, 2: *Nabuchodonosor divinitus somniat*. — **nulla . . . est**: for *extraneus* followed by a genit., see the note on 25, 2. Tert. frequently mentions the rapid increase of Christianity, e. g. *apol.* 37, 4: *hesterni sumus et orbem iam et vestra omnia implevimus*; *ib.* 1, 7; *ad nat.* 1, 1, 2; 1, 7, 18; 1, 8, 9; 1, 16, 6; *ad Scap.* 2 and 5; *fuga* 6; *adv. Iud.* 7 and 14. Cf. Harnack, *Mission*, 2, 1/15; P. Allard, *Dix leçons sur le martyre*, 1/84; Guignebert, 40. — **coruscante**: this verb is frequently associated by Christian authors with *evangelium*, especially by Hier. (who probably here, too, imitates Tert.); cf. *Thes. l. L. IV*: 1075, 52/7; Faust. *Rei. homil.* 2 (Caspari, *Kirchenhist. Anecd.*, 338): *per universum orbem gratia coruscante*. — **Num**, which has the sense of *nonne* as in 47, 3, must be retained (cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 41). The subordinate clause introduced by *dum ne* is best translated by a principal sentence: "Only we must not believe . . ."; cf. the passages collected by Thörnell, *op. cit.*, 1, 28/30, especially *adv. Marc.* 4, 21 (488, 5): *haec Marcion deleat, dum sensui salva sint* (= *h. M. d.: certe sensui salva sint*). — **Aristoteli**: this should of course be *Herodoto*, cf. § 2: *Porro aut Herodoto fama mentita est*; hence Hartel proposes to excise *Aristoteli*, Kroymann to read *Herodoto* (Thörnell (*op. cit.*, 2, 41) leaves the question undecided). The most probable solution seems to be that Tert. indeed wrote *Aristoteli*. We may refer to the text of Aristotle, who also speaks about rumour (τοῖς ἐν Σαρδοῖ μὴ θολοῦν τοῦ μένους καθεύδειν), but on the other hand we must point out that Tert. did not doubt the accuracy of the note from Aristotle, whereas the note from Herodotus was positively distasteful to him: the main attack in this chapter was directed against it, so that we may expect that in the conclusion it is mentioned by way of refutation. The only remaining possibility is that Tert. meant to write *Herodoto* and erroneously wrote *Aristoteli*; for the carelessness often shown by Tert., cf. the note on 46, 5. — **adhuc** (*ad hoc* Reifferscheid) is certainly right ("noch immer", Thörnell, *loc. cit.*). — **animae aliqua natura**: through the influence of the demons a soul may become *immunis somniorum*; but this is a transient condition which can never be due to the nature of the soul itself.

50. *Menander's baptism.*

"After our discussion of sleep and dream we now turn to death, which also presents its peculiar problems (§ 1). Death may be defined as our debt to nature; this is generally admitted, and suffices to refute Menander, the heretic and magician, who contended that by baptizing people he could make them immortal (§ 2). Now there are undoubtedly very peculiar kinds of water which have the power to make men insane or drunk, to kill and to heal them (§ 3), but neither John the Baptist nor Christ knew anything about baptismal water with such miraculous properties. Besides, why is this wonderful baptism known to very few people only? And if men could be made immortal outright, how is it then that God exacts death from us, even by martyrdom, and that He even exacted it from His own

Son? And if my opponents allege that Menander had great powers as a magician, I say in reply that against death all magic arts are powerless (§ 4). It is true that Enoch and Elias never died, but this had a special reason, as they were spirited away, and will come back in the fulness of time, after which they too will die. Formerly people believed that St. John the Evangelist was immortal — but that, too, proved to be untrue. <So it is safe to say that death concerns all human beings, none excepted>. Finally we may put a question by which to refute Menander once and for all: where are his immortal apostles? Let me see them and I will believe him! (§ 5)".

With the exception of a quotation from Plin. *n. h.* (see comm. on § 3), the only source used in this chapter is the account given by Irenaeus of the baptism of Menander (that Tert.'s description does not contain more particulars than that of Irenaeus, is also admitted by Hilgenfeld (*Ketzergeschichte*, 188₃₁₁), though he again (*ib.*, 187/90) supposes that Tert. made use here of the Σύνταγμα of Justin; see for this question the preface to ch. 34). Irenaeus writes (1, 17 ex.): *Resurrectionem enim per id quod est in eum baptismum accipere eius discipulos, et ultra non posse mori, sed perseverare non senescentes et immortales* (this passage was copied by Epiphanius. *Panar.* 22, 1). Cf. also Justin apol. 1, 26, 4: ὁς καὶ τοὺς αὐτῷ ἐπομένους ὡς μηδὲ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐπεισε· καὶ νῦν εἰσὶ τινες ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦτο ὁμολογοῦντες (used by Euseb. *hist. eccles.* 3, 26, 3). A shorter note is found in [Tert.] *Adv. omn. haeres.* 1 (214, 4/5): *negans habere posse quemquam salutem, nisi in nomine suo baptizatus fuisset*. For other sources, see Hilgenfeld, *loc. cit.* Concerning the first sentence of the chapter, cf. Introduction, p. 50*. For the belief that a μυθηῖς becomes immortal, see Reitz., *Hellen. Myster.*, 222 and 253.

1. *speculo mortis* is repeated from 42, 3 to take up the discussion after the digression in ch. 43/9; cf. the note on 25, 1. — *cum* (A B) may be retained, if taken in a causal sense. — *nunc . . . excessus*: cf. 25, 1: *Iam nunc regrediar ad causam huius excessus*. As to the ellipsis, cf. 35, 4: *Ceterum ad Carpocraten* and 44, 1. — *ordinem mortis*: "death with every thing concerning it, discussed in due order"; cf. 22, 1: *ut ordinem eius expungam*. — *ipsam . . . finem*, i. e. οὐσαν (Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 55/6); Reifferscheid's conjecture *ipsa . . . finis* is certainly wrong. As to the *constructio ad sensum* (*ipsam* ∼ *mortis*, not ∼ *ordinem*), cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 122₂, who to the abbreviated sentence introduced by *quia* compares *test. an.* 4 (138, 25): *misellum vocas eum* (i. e. defunctum), *non utique quod (ut Reifferscheid) de bono vitae ereptum*; see also Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 70 *seqq.*; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 58 *seq.*; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 2, 17. — *finem . . . quaestionum*: repeated from 42, 1: *De morte iam superest, ut illic materia ponat, ubi ipsa anima consummat*.

2. *mortem naturae debitum*: cf. e. g. (Thes. l. L. V 1: 106, 24/33) Nepos *reg.* 1, 5: *morbo naturae debitum reddiderunt*; Hygin. *astron.* 2, 20. It is probable that Tert. follows Seneca, e. g. *de remed. fortuit.* (quoted in *apol.* 50, 14) 2, 8 (p. 448 Haase): 'morieris'. *immo carnis*

tributum naturae debitum persolves, mox futurus liber. To the passages quoted in the Thes. l. L. (*loc. cit.*, l. 51/4), Amm. Marc. 25, 3, 15 and Ambros. *expos. evang. Luc.* 8, 74. 76 may be added. From Tert.'s works cf. *c. Chr.* 6, 39/40; *spect.* 2 (2, 20); *mon.* 9. 10; *scorp.* 8 (160, 17); for the use of *debitum* in Tert.'s works, cf. Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 75. — *stipulata est . . . spopondit*: law terms; cf. *fuga* 12, 2: *apud inferos remancipatio nostra est et stipulatio nostra in caelis* (see Thierry's note). — *Epicuri stupor*: cf. comm. on 3, 2. — *suffundatur* = '*suffundi* (38, 2) *cogatur*', cf. 46, 3: *Epicuro pudorem imperabo*. — *negantis . . . pertinere*: here the connection with ch. 42 is broken off. — *magi* certainly is the correct reading, cf. e. g. Iren. 1, 17: *huius* (sc. Simonis) *successor fuit Menander, Samarites genere, qui et ipse ad summum magiae pervenit*. — *furor conspuatur*: Theophrast. *charact.* 16, 14: *μαινόμενον δὲ ἰδὼν* (viz. ὁ δεισιδαίμων) *ἢ ἐπιληπτον, φρίζας εἰς κόλπον πτύσαι*; for the habit of spitting at sight of epileptics, cf. Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 186/7, for spitting for the purpose of averting evil in general, Heim, *Incantamenta magica*, 489²; Helm, *Lucian u. Menipp*, 261; 311₆; F. W. Nicholson, *The Saliva Superstition in classical Literature* (Harvard Studies 8 (1897), 23 *seqq.*); X. F. M. G. Wolters, *Notes on antique Folklore* (Amsterdam 1935), 67/9; Riess, art. 'Aberglaube', R. E. I, 87/8; W. Kroll, *Antiker Aberglaube* (Hamburg 1897), 23 and 30/1. The Christians used to spit when they saw statues of pagan gods; cf. Abt, *op. cit.*, 187₆; Dölger, *Exorzismus*, 118 and ACh 3 (1932), 199/203. From Tert.'s works cf. *idol.* 11 (42, 21/2); *spect.* 13 (15, 23). *Καταπτύειν*, *conspuere*, and *despuere* are frequently used metaphorically, e. g. Lucian. *fugit.* 21: οἱ ἰδιῶται δὲ ταῦτα ὀρῶντες καταπτύουσιν τῆς φιλοσοφίας; Plut. *de liber. educ.* 7 (4 C); Tert. *adv. Marc.* 1, 29 (331, 9/10): *sic nec matrimonii res . . . despuentur*; *c. Chr.* 4, 14; *test. anim.* 1 (135, 2); *ad nat.* 1, 6, 6 and 1, 10, 10. — *dicentis*, etc.: for the power of baptism as viewed by the Gnostics (remission of sins; expulsion of demons; opening of the way to the *pleroma*), see Bousset, *Hauptprobl.*, 294/5, and Anrich, *Myster.*, 93. For this assertion of Menander, cf. Lucian. *de morte Peregr.* 13, where the Christians are upbraided for regarding themselves as immortal. For the connection between Gnosis and magic, cf. Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 2, 1. — *baptisma . . . induerint*: *bapt.* 12, 2: *cum Paulus . . . baptismum Christi induerit* (cf. *ib.* 13, 2). The expression is due to Gal. 3, 27: ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε (cf. *fuga* 10, 2); according to Lietzmann (*Hdb. N. T.* 10, p. 23), it is based on the idea of the endowment of a 'pneumatic body'. A different interpretation is given by Oepke (*Theol. Wörterb. zum N T*, 2, 320: "Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε is etwa gleichbedeutend mit 'ihr seid mit Christus bekleidet worden, ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ'"). Cf. also Dölger, *IX Θ Υ Σ*, 1, 116/7, who repudiates every connection with 'the religious masquerade of Mithraism', but does not preclude a possible association with the "morgenländisch-babylonische Auffassung von dem Anziehen des Fischgottes". For the metaphorical use of ἐνδύεσθαι he quotes LXX Job 8, 22; 29, 14; Ps. 131, 9; Luc. 24, 49. The verb is frequently used by St. Paul, more literally in Rom. 13, 12; Ephes. 6, 11. 14;

1 Thess. 5, 8, metaphorically in Ephes. 4, 24: ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον; Coloss. 3, 10, 12; 1 Cor. 15, 53; 2 Cor. 5, 2/3; Rom. 13, 14: ἀλλὰ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, which may be compared to Gal. 3, 27, but “imperativisch-ethisch und deshalb mit activem Akzent” (Oepke, *loc. cit.*, who rejects Dölger’s interpretation and concludes: “Hier steht vielmehr die eschatologische Auffassung des Christus als des zweiten Urmenschen, als *anima generalis* dahinter”; cf. *ib.* for more passages, especially from the *Pastor Hermæ*, to which we may add *simil.* 9,2 4, 2). In the so-called odes of Solomon this conception is very frequently found, e. g. 7, 4; 13, 3; 15, 8; 20, 7; 21, 3; 25, 8; 33, 12; 39, 8. For more materials, cf. Schlier, *Ignat.*, 140; Bousset, *Hauptprobl.*, 303₂; Wetter, *Charis*, 109₂ and 132; Kroll, *Hermes Trism.*, 341₅ and 347₄. The most striking parallel to the passage under discussion is furnished by *Acta Thomæ* 132: ὁ τὸ λουτρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐνδύμενος, to which Bousset (*Hauptprobl.*, 296₁) remarks: “Die ursprünglich hier zugrunde liegende Vorstellung ist diese, dass der Fromme im Wasserbad die Wassergottheit wie ein Kleid anzieht” (unfortunately he does not adduce any proof of this assertion). Cf. *ib.* 157: δύναιμις ἢ τοῦ ξύλου, ἣν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐνδύμενοι, etc. The conception ‘garb of baptism’ is widely-spread, e. g. [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 36: *baptismi . . . indumentum*; Optat. Milev. 5, 10: (*baptisma*) *tunica semper una et immutabilis*; Ambros. *expos. in evang. Luc.* 5, 25: *servemus igitur vestem, quam nos sacro Dominus emergentes fonte vestivit*; Caspari, *Briefe, Abh. u. Pred.*, p. 200: *stola baptismi*; *Act. Barnab.* 13; Eucher. *form.* 5 (34, 4 Wotke) and 6 (38, 16/7): *stola* (≈ *Luc.* 15, 22) *indumentum baptismi vel fidei*; Cyrill. Hieros. *catech. mystag.* 2, 2 (2, 356.358 Rupp); Hier. *ep.* 64, 19, 3 (*baptism = indumentum Christi*); Basil. (*ep.* 292 *ad Pallad.*, P. G. 32, 1033) denotes baptism as ἀθάνατον ἐνδυμα, ὃ περισχὸν ἡμῶν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ θάνατον ἐξήφανισε, καὶ κατεπόθη τὸ θνητὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἐνδύματι (see for this passage, Anrich, *Myster.*, 180/1). Cf. also *Acta Xantipp.* et *Polyxen.* 18 (James, *Apocr. Anecd.*, 1, 71, 5/6): τὸν ἀκαταμάχητον τοῦ βαπτίσματος . . . θώρακα. In Tert.’s work we may also refer to *res.* 56 (116, 2/3): (*anima*) *quae . . . Christum induit* and *mon.* 7. For the use of *induere*, see the note on 33, 9.

3. *aquarum genera miranda*: cf. the note on 44, 2: *genus . . . gravioris . . . soporis*. — *ebriosos . . . venenata*: repeated in (or from) *adv.* Val. 15 (194, 21/3): (*habuit Achamoth lacrimas*) *et venenatas, ut et Nonacris inde sudaverit, quae Alexandrum occidit, et Lyncestarum inde defluerit, quae ebriosos efficit*. The source is Plin. *n. h.* 2, 230/2: (230): *Lyncestis aqua quae vocatur acidula vini modo temulentos facit*; (232): *Colophone in Apollinis Clari specu lacuna est cuius potu mira redduntur oracula, bibentium brevior vita*; (231): *Iuxta Nonacrim in Arcadia Styx nec odore differens nec colore epota ilico necat*. Cf. J. Weiss, art. ‘Lynkestis’, R. E. XIII, 2469, E. Meyer, art. ‘Nonacris’, *ib.* XVII, 859/61, and for the source in Colophon, Adler, *ib.* XI, 549 and Buresch, *Klaros*, 29 *seqq.* The priests of Apollo used to drink the water from the last-mentioned source before prophesying; of course Tert. here

again sees the influence of demons (cf. the note on 1, 5: *Pythii* . . . *daemonis*). — **Alexandrum**: Tert. refers to the rumour according to which poison was given to Alexander at the instigation of Antipater, who was said to have obtained it from Aristotle. Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 77: τὸ δὲ φάρμακον (viz. which was said to have killed A.) ὕδωρ εἶναι ψυχρὸν καὶ παγετῶδες ἀπὸ πέτρας τινὸς ἐν Νωνάκριδι οὔσης (cf. also *prim. frig.* 20, 954 C); Arrian. 7, 27, 1/2 (both authors are fairly sceptic about this rumour); Justin. 12, 13, 14 (very positive; does not mention Aristotle); Curt. 10, 10, 14 ('*credidere plerique*'; does not speak of Aristotle either); Vitruv. 8, 3, 16; Pausan. 8, 18, 4 *seqq.*; Plin. *n. h.* 30, 149; see also Jaeger, *Diokles*, 63/4; Bölte, *R. E.* II 4, 463. Since only Plutarch and Pausanias mention the Nonacris in this context, Tert. cannot have used Pliny here. The very similar passage in *adv. Val.* 15 and the parallelism of the sentences make it certain that we must read *aut Alexandrum occidit* (Junius' conjecture *aut ut A. o.* spoils this parallelism, which, though rather remarkable, must be retained; for similar cases, see Norden, *Min. Fel.*, 18 *seqq.*). — **laeus medicus**, viz. the *piscina Bethsaida* (Ioh. 5, 2/4). — **ante Christum**: cf. *bapt.* 5, 5: *piscinam Bethsaidam angelus interveniens commovebat . . . Figura ista medicinae corporalis spiritalem medicinam canebat, ex ea forma qua semper carnalia in figura <m> spiritalium antecedunt. Iudaeae* is probably a dat., but it may also be a locat. (cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 21). — **Stygias paludes**: a reminiscence of Verg. *Aen.* 6, 323 (369). — **diluentes**: Junius' conjecture *deluentes* is certainly wrong, cf. *bapt.* 2, 2: *lavacro dilui mortem*; [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 2 (19, 20/1 Batiff.-Wilm.): *ut peccata baptismo diluerent*; *ib.* 15 (167, 17); Thes. I. L. V, 1: 1190, 22 *seqq.*; from Tert.'s works, cf. also *pud.* 12 (241, 22) and *orat.* 29 (199, 25). — **si et Menander in Stygem mergit**: no other accounts of Menander's baptism than the short note given by Irenaeus (see the preface, p. 519) being known, it is impossible to define exactly the nature of the custom to which Tert. alludes here. It is quite possible that Menander 'the magician', who (if he was a Christian at all) certainly was a pagan, and not an orthodox Christian, before he became a heretic (in this connection cf. the main thesis of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*), baptized his followers in water which he pretended to be (or to have come from) the Styx. For the belief that water from the Styx could bestow immortality, see the literature quoted by O. Waser, *Roscher* IV, 1576 (in general cf. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 90 *seqq.*). A parallel is furnished by the baptism in the λίμνη Ἀχέρουσία mentioned in *Apoc. Petri* 14 (from the Greek text it is evident that this λίμνη was regarded as situated in the Elysium, cf. K. Schneider, *RAC* I, 72); cf. also *Visio Pauli* 22 (James, *Apocryph. Anecd.* 1, 23, 30 *seqq.*): *cum exierit de corpore* (viz. the converted sinner), *ducitur et adoratur deum et inde iussu domini traditur Michaelo angelo et baptizatur eum in acerosium lacum; sic inducit eum in civitatem Christi iuxta (i. e. iuxta) eos qui nihil peccaverunt*. The late professor Dölger, with whom in 1931 I discussed the present passage, assumed that it contained an allusion to the poet Menander, and in this connection referred to Ovid *Ibis* 591/2:

Comicus ut mediis periit dum nabat in undis, et tua sic Stygius strangulet ora liquor. But firstly these verses probably refer either to Eupolis or to Terence, secondly Tert. in a subsequent sentence mentions this poet in a remark (*Quod hoc Menandri balneum? Comicum credo*) which would lose its point, if the *comicus* had been referred to already.

4. *baptizator* is Tp (also in *bapt.* 12, 5 = Matth. 11, 11 and *adv. Iud.* 8, 106 = *ib.* 11, 13; -*istam* F. Kroym.); see Thes. l. L. II: 1720, 27 *seqq.*; Matzkow, 34; Mohrmann, *Aug.*, 84/5; 244; 248. — *balneum*: to my knowledge, it is only in the present passage that this word denotes baptism. Obviously Tert. wanted to avoid *lavacrum*, baptism by a heretic being meant. We may compare the use of *tingere* and *tinctio*, which words also frequently denote baptism in heretical sects. For further particulars, see Sainio, 30; Teeuwen, 48; Watson, 264. — *Comicum* is certainly the correct reading; Tert. alludes to the poet Menander, who was much better known than the heretic. Similarly, in ch. 34 he continuously compares Simon's Helen to Helen of Troy; cf. also the notes on 28, 1: *divinior* and 32, 2: *thamni*. The poet is mentioned by Tert. in *pall.* 4, 8 (cf. Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 72): *prorsus si quis Menandrico fluxu delicatam vestem humi protrahat, audiat penes se quod dicit comicus*. Irenaeus, too, mentions him in a passage in which he ridicules the Gnostics (2, 25): *sed mihi videntur eius passionem, qui est apud comicum Menandrum valde amans et odibilis* (viz. in the Μισούμενος, cf. Meineke, *Men. et Philem. reliq.*, p. 116) *Aeoni suo circumdedit*. — *lavant* has intransitive meaning as in *orat.* 14 (189, 7); *bapt.* 12, 3; 16, 2, etc. Cf. Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 23. — *securissimi*: 'procuring perfect security'; the causative sense is also found in *scorp.* 6 (158, 9/10): *posuit igitur secunda solacia et extrema praesidia, dimicationem martyrii et lavacrum sanguinis exinde securum* (*secuturum* Reifferscheid; see my discussion of this passage, *Mnemos.*, ser. III, 12 (1944), 73/4) and in Verg. *Aen.* 6, 715/6: *Lethaei ad fluminis undam / securos latices et longa oblivia potant* (see Norden's note in which he compares Plato *Resp.* 10, 621 A: ἀμέλης ποταμός), imitated by Ovid, *ep. ex Ponto* 2, 4, 23: *securae pocula Lethes*, and by the author of *carm. de resurr. mort.* 38: *securam vivamque . . . nympham* (i. e. *aquam baptismi*). — *tutissimi* also has causative force; many instances of this meaning are given by Forcellini s. v. 5), but only one of them is convincing, viz. Tibull. 4, 1, 83: *tutam castris praeducere fossam*. A complete parallel is furnished by Paulin. Nol. *carm.* 27, 401: *altaria tuta*, 'the protective altar'. — *apud quod . . . exegit*: with *pro deo ipso mori* Tert. means martyrdom, as is proved by 55, 5: *Nova mors pro deo et extraordinaria pro Christo alio et privato excipitur hospitio*. The contents of the present passage may be paraphrased in the following way: "If this baptism by Menander bestows immortality on men, it makes martyrdom superfluous; but throughout the world there are men ready to die for the true faith, and God exacts death from us even through martyrdom; <hence Menander's baptism is plainly contrary to God's will and therefore condemned>". To this argument two comments are added which were suggested to Tert. as *argumenta*

a fortiori by the mentioning of martyrdom, and which may be paraphrased by the following syllogisms: A. "God exacts death from us even through martyrdom; <martyrdom, which is a violent kind of death (cf. p. 567), is much more terrible than a natural death. So we may be sure that God at the very least exacts a natural death from us; but then Menander's baptism is impossible>"; B. "God exacted death even from Christ, <we are greatly inferior to Christ, so God will certainly exact death from us, but then, etc.>". The function of these two remarks as *argumenta a fortiori* is evident from the use of *quoque* and *etiam*. Being a Montanist, Tert. attaches very great importance to martyrdom (*nec pro deo ipso mori; dei... mortem per martyrium quoque flagitantis*); cf. the comm. on ch. 55 (p. 554). Concerning Menander our sources do not inform us explicitly that he thought martyrdom superfluous, but his view about baptism makes it highly probable that he did; at any rate, it is certain that several Gnostics held this view, cf. e. g. Iren. 3, 19, 4: *Et cum haec ita se habeant, ad tantam temeritatem progressi sunt quidam, ut etiam martyres spernant, et vituperent eos qui propter Domini confessionem occiduntur, et sustinent omnia a Domino praedicata, et secundum hoc conantur vestigia assequi passionis Domini, passibilis* (τοῦ παθητοῦ, Christi sc., Harvey) *martyres facti; quos et concedimus ipsis martyribus* (οὓς καὶ συγχωροῦμεν τοῖς μάρτυσι, i. e. connumeramus, H.). *Cum enim inquireretur sanguis eorum, et gloriam consequentur, tunc a Christo confundentur omnes qui inhonoraverunt eorum martyrium*. For *quam... exegit*, cf. 55, 2: *Christus... forma humanae mortis apud inferos functus* and the comm.; there, too, the death of Christ is advanced as an *argumentum a fortiori* in confutation of those, *qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum*. One might be tempted to read *quod* instead of *quam* in the present passage; but, though Christ was sometimes regarded as a βαιοθάνατος (see the preface to ch. 56), he was never, as far as I know, qualified as a martyr (if we except such rhetorical phrases as Aug. *serm.* 334, 2: *martyrem martyrum, testem testium*). — *cum... Jacob*: the sense of this passage becomes clear if we compare with it *fuga* 1, 4: *hoc nomine iudicium est persecutio, per quam quis aut probatus aut reprobatus iudicatur: porro iudicium soli deo competit... Hae... scalae, quas somniat Iacob, aliis ascensum in superiora, aliis descensum ad inferiora demonstrantes* and *adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (421, 5/9): *cum vero Iacob somniat scalas obfirmatas in terra ad caelum et angelos alios ascendentes alios descendentes et innixum desuper dominum, temere, si forte, interpretabimur scalis his iter ad caelum demonstrari, quo alii perveniant, unde alii decendant, domini constitutum esse iudicium* (before domini Kroymann wrongly assumes a lacuna). Cf. also *Pass. Perpet.* 4, 2/5: *ostensum est mihi* (sc. Perpetuae) *hoc: Video scalam aeream mirae magnitudinis, pertingentem usque ad caelum, et angustam, per quam nonnisi singuli ascendere possent, et in lateribus scalae omne genus ferrarum infixum. Erant ibi gladii, lanceae, hami, macherae, verruta... Et erat sub ipsa scala draco cubans mirae magnitudinis,*

qui ascendentibus insidias praestabat... Ascendit autem Satorus prior (≈ 21, 8: *multo magis Satorus, qui et prior ascenderat, prior reddidit spiritum*). Jacob's dream about the ladder leading to heaven (Gen. 28, 12/5) is interpreted by Tert. both as a *figura* of the *iudicium dei* (*fuga* and *adv. Marc.*, *loc. cit.*), and as an *exemplum* of martyrdom as an *ascensus in caelum* (cf. the preface to ch. 55); those who ascend (here denoted by *omnes nationes*, cf. the note on 49,3: *in omnem terram... coruscante*) are the Christians who do not fear to die for their faith. To them Tert. opposes Menander, whose followers obtain immortality in an easier way, not *baptismo sanguinis* (cf. 55, 5), but already by their first baptism. — *Nec magiae*, etc.: since Menander is a magician no less than a heretic (§ 2: *haeretici magi Menandri*), Tert. must also consider this second factor, lest Menander should be able to achieve as a *magus* what he could not achieve as a heretic. — *dabit* = *concedet*, cf. the note on 10, 9. — *repastinet*: Tert. has a partiality for the metaphorical use of this verb, cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 18 (359, 19); *paen.* 11, 2; *cult. fem.* 2, 9, 5; *exh. cast.* 6, 18. — *aetate renovata*: "the consequence of which is a renewal of life"; for this ablat. of result, see the note on 19, 5. — *Medeae... vervecem*: cf. O. Seeliger, art. 'Medea', Roscher II, 2491.

5. *Translatus est Enoch et Helias*: the view that Enoch and Elias were the two *μάρτυρες* mentioned in Apoc. 11, 3 is found from Iren., Tert., Hippol., and the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus downwards (according to the original Judaic view, which is also presupposed in the Gospels, only Elias will return). For this subject (especially for the view that Elias and Moses are the *μάρτυρες*), cf. W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, 134/9; for Enoch, cf. also Gunkel's note on Gen. 5, 21/4. — *nec... reperta est*: cf. Gen. 5, 24 (Hebr. 11, 5). — *ut antichristum*, etc.: cf. Bousset, *loc. cit.*; Martin, *Stud. z. Kommodian*, 118/29. — *Iohannes... spes*: this legend was caused by Joh. 21, 23: *ἐξῆλθεν οὖν οὗτος ὁ λόγος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει*; it is found down to Frechulphus, *Chron.* 2, 2, 9 (P. L. 106, 1155); cf. E. Schwartz, *Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei* (Abh. Götting. VII, 5, 1904), 52/3; Th. Zahn, *Acta Ioannis*, CXXXII seqq.; P. Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien* (TU XV, 1 (1896)), 97/9. In *praescr.* 36, 13/5 Tert. mentions his trial at Rome: *ubi apostolus Iohannes, postquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur* (copied by Hieron., *adv. Iovinian.* 1, 26 and in *Matth.* 20, 23; cf. Bickel, *Diatrise*, 252/60; Linsenmayer, *Histor. Jahrb.* 1904, 462; Salmon, *Introduction to NT.*, 382). — *sumentes*: cf. e. g. Iren. 2 *praef.*: *omnes a Simone haeretico initia sumentes*; *ib.* 2, 18, 3: *umbram autem et vacuum ipsorum a Democrito et Epicuro sumentes* (haeretici). — *praesidia quo pugnant*: *quo* probably refers to the entire preceding sentence; for a similar case, see comm. on 25, 3. — *compendium*, a law term (cf. Beck, 87), frequently used by Tert., especially in his polemics against heretics, and then often connected with *praescriptio* (-scribere), e. g. *adv. Herm.* 1 (126, 3); *adv. Marc.* 1, 1 (292, 9/10); 3, 1 (377, 22); 5, 19 (642, 27). For Cypr.,

cf. Koch, *Cypr. Unters.*, 185. 481; Schrijn.-Mohrm., 1, 142. — *perfudit*: a purism instead of *baptizavit*; also *bapt.* 12, 3: (Petro) *perfundi volenti*; Prud. *dittoch.* 117; Optat. Milev. 4, 7; Venant. Fortun. *Vita Germani* 51, 141; here again Tert. wants to avoid the Christian term (cf. the use of *balneum*, § 4). — With *meus Thomas* Tert means himself (the right interpretation was found by Junius); the expression is best explained by comparing Apuleius' *reddite me meo Lucio* or *meus homo*, for which see 35, 6; cf. *Cypr. ep.* 39, 2 (582, 26 *seqq.* H.): *et si aliquis Thomae similis extiterit qui minus auribus credat, nec oculorum fides deest ut quis quod audit et videat.* — *credidit* is the correct reading (also supported by the *clausula*, Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 91/2). It has ingressive force, and has become almost equivalent to *credo*. Cf. Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 58; 2, 16 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 560; Salon., *V. P.*, 292/3; Hoogterp, 173; Merckx, 93/7; von Soden, *N. T. Cypr.*, 159. Of this ingressive sense, which is rightly regarded as a 'Christianism' by Schrijn.-Mohrm., isolated instances are found in earlier times. Axelson (*Neue Sen.-Stud.*, 70/1) quotes Hor. *ep.* 1, 2, 5: *cur ita crediderim* ("woraus ich diese Überzeugung gewonnen habe" Kiessling); Sen. *ep.* 23, 6; 59, 11 (p.); 78, 13; 82, 16; 108, 16; *de benef.* 4, 33, 2. Add Tac. *hist.* 1, 10, 3: *occulta fati et ostentis ac responsis destinatum Vespasiano liberisque eius imperium post fortunam credidimus*; for Columella, cf. Dahllöf, 21. For *videat . . . et credidit*, cf. Ovid *remed.* 22: *desinat: et nulli funeris auctor eris*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 660.

51. *Death a complete separation of body and soul.*

"It is clear to everybody that the function of death consists in the separation of body and soul. Nevertheless some philosophers try to support the doctrine of the immortality of the soul by contending that after death some souls remain attached to their bodies (§ 1). For instance Plato in the 'Republic' relates how a dead body remained intact for a long time, which fact should of course be ascribed to the circumstance that the soul was not yet separated from the body; Democritus refers to the fact that nails and hair continue to grow in dead bodies (§ 2). However, we may easily find a different explanation for these facts (§ 3). — It is also impossible that a small portion of the soul is left behind in the body and does not depart, before the entire body has been destroyed by time (this argument is sometimes brought forward against cremation; however, we Christians have better arguments at our disposal) (§ 4). In accordance with the indivisibility of the immortal soul death must come once only (§ 5). — It is true that there are cases which seem to argue in favour of the opposite view: for instance once a Christian woman folded her hands in prayer after death (§ 6), and in another case a body in the grave made room for another body placed beside it. These, however, are miracles (§ 7), which do not prove anything with regard to the natural form of death (§ 8)".

The question discussed in this chapter seems to have been a well-known problem; it was also raised by Lucretius, 3, 713/4: *semina*

praeterea linquuntur necne, animai/corpore in exanimo? (though he gives no decisive answer, it is clear from 3, 398/9 that this answer would have been negative; see Heinze, *Lucr. III*, 148). That Soranus, too, expressed his views about this subject, is highly probable, for in 53, 1 Tert. relates that the *medici* (in point of fact meaning: 'Soranus'; cf. the note on 13, 2) discussed the various kinds of death (see also Karpp, p. 40/1; however, I cannot share his view that 51, 1/5 is very closely connected with the contents of ch. 53: the latter chapter has its special theme, i. e. the lingering kind of death). This supposition is supported by the words *habes medicos* in § 3. Since these words are mentioned after the refutation of Democritus, we may, moreover, assume that Tert. took from Soranus the account of the view of this philosopher as well as its refutation; as for the allusion to Plato's *Republic*, which may have been borrowed from the same source, though another solution is also possible, see the comm. on § 2.

According to Karpp, §§ 4 and 5 may also hark back to Soranus; however, § 4 perhaps contains an echo of the discussion among Christians about cremation, and the view upheld in § 5 cannot possibly have come from a man who regarded the soul as mortal.

1. *in medio est*: 'is obvious'; cf. *apol.* 23, 7: *simplicitas veritatis in medio est* ("éclate aux yeux de tous", Waltzing); *iei.* 11 (289, 9); see also Weyman, *A. L. L.* 8, 406. — *discretio*, etc.: the definition given by the Stoics, e. g. *St. V. F.* 2, frag. 604: ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος μὲν ἐστὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος. — *non . . . edocti*: in the later period *edocere* becomes equivalent to *docere* (*Thes.* 1. *L.* V, 2: 106, 26). For this passage, cf. *apol.* 45, 1: *innocentiam a deo edocti* (*doctore F*); *ib.* 21, 4; *adv. Iud.* 3, 70: *nos . . . in nova lege edocti*; [*Cypr.*] *de Pascha* 6 (252, 13 H.): *Hebraei . . . spiritu dei edocti*; *ib.* 11 (258, 10/1); *Iren.* 2, 15, 3: *a veritate docti*; *Lactant. div. inst.* 7, 7, 4: *eius . . . qui sit doctus a deo*. Perhaps these passages were influenced by 1 Thess. 4, 9: θεοδιδασκτοί ἐστε. — *argumentationes*: see comm. on 2, 5. — *emendicant*: likewise, *adv. Marc.* 4, 30 (525, 13): *mendicantibus argumenta*. Cf. also *Hier. ep.* 143, 2, 1: *verbis tinnulis atque emendicatis*; *Aug. ep.* 118, 11: *emendicatorum discordantium sententiarum alienarum*. Thus in Greek the metaphorical use of ἐραυίζεσθαι, e. g. Theodoret. *Cyren. Eranistes, praef.* (P. G. 83, 28 B): ἐκ πολλῶν αἰρέσεων ἡρανίσαντο τὴν ἀσέβειαν; *Olympiodor. in Phaed.* p. 65, 18 Norvin; *Lucian. Vit. auct.* 12.

2. *expedit*: cf. 54, 2: *sublimantur, quas vult*, sc. *animas puerariorum*; cf. *ib.* — *Politia*: the same title is mentioned by *Hier. adv. Iovin.* 2, 7 (see Goelz., *Jér.*, 215). — *individuitate*: *Tp* (also *adv. Prax.* 22 (268, 8); *adv. Marc.* 4, 22 (492, 22); *mon.* 5). *prae animae individuitate* does not mean 'on account of the indivisibility of the soul', but 'on account of the inseparability of the soul <from the body>'; likewise, *adv. Prax., loc. cit.*: *quia per individuitatem* (sc. *patris et filii*) *neque agnosci neque ignorari alter sine altero potest*. This addition is in flat contradiction with the text of Plato, who explicitly says that the soul of Er had left his body (614 B: ἐπειδὴ οὗ ἐκβῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν), the

whole myth indeed being based on this detail; for a possible explanation, see the next note. A better estimation of this myth is given by Clem. Alex. (*strom.* 5, 14, 106) and by Orig. (*c. Cels.* 2, 16), who regard it as a parallel to the doctrine of resurrection. — **Democritus**, etc.: the same argument is found in Plotin. 4, 4, 29: μαρτυροῦσι δὲ καὶ τρίχες φυόμεναι ἐπὶ τῶν νεκρῶν σωμάτων καὶ ὄνυχες αὐξόμεναι (viz. ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ἐπ' ὀλίγον ἔτι τὸ ζωτικὸν ἔχει). W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, 86, makes the very plausible supposition that Plotinus in this passage follows Posidonius, who, as is generally known, borrowed numerous data concerning biology from Democritus. That this philosopher assumed a limited continuation of life in the body after death, may be regarded as certain on account of several notes found in later authors, viz. Aët. 4, 4, 7 (frag. A 117 Diels): ὁ δὲ Δ. πάντα μετέχειν φησὶ ψυχῆς ποιᾶς, καὶ τὰ νεκρὰ τῶν σωμάτων, διότι αἰεὶ διαφανῶς τινος θερμοῦ καὶ αἰσθητικοῦ μετέχει τοῦ πλείονος διαπνεομένου; ib. 4, 9, 20: Δ. <καὶ> τὰ νεκρὰ τῶν σωμάτων αἰσθάνεσθαι; Stob., exc. e *MS floril. Ioann. Damascen.* 2, 25, 40; Alex. Aphrodis. *Top.* 21, 21 (A 117 D.); Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 34, 82 (A 160 D): *fac enim sic animum interire ut corpus: num igitur aliquis dolor aut omnino post mortem sensus in corpore est? nemo id quidem dicit, etsi Democritum insinulat Epicurus, Democriti negant.* According to Celsus (A 160 D.), Democritus asserted that there were no quite certain signs that life has ceased. Cf. also Plin. *n. h.* 7, 189 (overlooked by Diels): *similis et de asservandis corporibus hominum ac reviviscendi promisso Democriti vanitas, qui non revixit ipse* (for the interpretation of this passage, see M. Wellmann, *Die Georgika des Demokritos*, Abh. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1921, philos.-hist. Klasse 4, p. 14). Finally, a very remarkable passage from Proclus' commentary on Plato's *Republic* (II, 113, 6 seqq. Kroll) must be mentioned. Proclus begins by relating that in his treatise Περὶ τῶν ἐν Αἰδου Democritus had discussed various cases of people who, apparently dead, had come back to life; next he attacks Colotes the Epicurean, who had doubted the possibility of the myth of Er the Pamphylian, and says that Colotes ought to have acquainted himself with the works of Democritus, τοῦ καθηγμένου τῶν Ἐπικούρου δογμάτων. To this he adds the following explanation: οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος ἦν ἀπόσβεσις, ὥς ἔοικεν, τῆς συμπάσης ζωῆς τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ μὲν πληγῆς τινος ἴσως καὶ τραύματος παρεῖτο, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς οἱ περὶ τὸν μυελὸν ἔμενον ἔτι δεσμοὶ κατερριζωμένοι καὶ ἡ καρδία τὸ ἐμπύρευμα τῆς ζωῆς εἶχεν ἐγκείμενον τῷ βάθει· καὶ τούτων μενόντων αὐθις ἀνεκτήσατο τὴν ἀπεσβηκυῖαν ζωὴν ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς τὴν ψύχασιν γενόμενον. According to Diels, this passage, which he inserts in his collection of the genuine fragments (B 1), contains an explanation of the case of Er given by Democritus in his work Περὶ τῶν ἐν Αἰδου. However, this supposition is far from plausible, firstly, because it is not at all certain that Democritus indeed used and combated the works of Plato (on the other hand, Plato was certainly influenced by Democritus; see the literature on this subject in Überweg-Prächter, 91*), secondly, because this explanation is evidently based on a passage from the *Timaeus* (73 A/B:

τὸ δὲ ὅστων καὶ σαρκῶν καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης φύσεως περὶ πάσης ὥδε ἔσχε. τοῦτοις ξύμπασιν ἀρχὴ μὲν ἡ τοῦ μ υ ε λ ο ὕ γένεσις· οἱ γὰρ τοῦ βίου δεσμοὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τῷ σώματι ξυνδουμένης ἐν τούτῳ διαδούμενοι κατερρίζουσιν τὸ θνητὸν γένος). So we must suppose (unless we assume that Democritus referred to the *Timaeus* to explain a passage from the *Republic*!) that Proclus did no more than mention the work of Democritus in this connection, and either took this explanation from the *Timaeus* himself or borrowed it from a predecessor. The latter possibility is more plausible, because the commentaries on Plato by Neoplatonists usually contain numerous particulars adopted from earlier Platonists (see the preface to chapter 24 and 29, 4 n.); moreover, this very explanation also occurs in the present chapter (*prae animae scilicet individuitate servatum*). It is not easy to decide where Tert. may have found this. In the preface to this chapter it was already pointed out that the words *Habes medicos* at the end of § 3 clearly show that the preceding refutation of the argument advanced by Democritus (the growth of hairs and nails in dead bodies) must have been taken from Soranus; since the refutation of Plato in the same paragraph is fairly similar, it is not out of the question that the former part of § 3 (and therewith the reference to the myth from the *Republic* in § 2) should be traced back to the same author. On the other hand, the possibility must certainly be taken into account that Tert. for this passage consulted Albinus, whose work contained numerous arguments and examples used by later Platonists (see the preface to ch. 24). At all events, Tert. is once more inaccurate by making it appear that the explanation transmitted to him by his source had been given by Plato himself. — For the consequences drawn by popular belief from the growth of hair and nails after death, cf. W. Kroll, *Antiker Aberglaube* (Hamburg 1897), 23; J. Frazer, *The golden bough*, 1, 49; Riess, art. 'Aberglaube' R. E. I, 85. The present passage was copied by Tert. himself in *res.* 58 (119, 2/3): *unguium et capillorum facilia crementa*. For *crementum*, see comm. on 25, 4. — in *sepulturis*, i. e. in *sepultis*, in *mortuis*, as in *apol.* 21, 21 (Fuld.): *praeter exuvias sepulturae* (cf. Löfst., *Apol.*, 96; Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 32/3); *adv. Marc.* 3, 19 (409, 21) and 4, 43 (566, 6); *res.* 30 (69, 1/2) and 42 (87, 25); see also Sjögren, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 140/1. — *tutela*: for the use of a nomin. instead of a *dativus finalis*, cf. comm. on 25, 6: *periculum est*. For the present passage, cf. e. g. Vellei. 2, 110, 4: *pars suis sedibus praesidium esse destinaverat* and Tac. *ann.* 15, 3, 1: *legiones duas... subsidium Tigrani mittit*.

3. *corruptelae* is the correct reading; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 19 and especially *Beitr.*, 19. — *erogarat*: see comm. on 30, 5. — *Ungues... nervorum*: [Arist.] *de spir.* 6 (484a 38 seq.): Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δὲ ἐκ νεύρου τὸν ὄνυχά τῇ πῆξει; Aët. 5, 22, 1: Ἐ... τοὺς... ὄνυχας τοὺς ζώοις γεννᾶσθαι τῶν νεύρων καθ' ὃ τῷ ἀέρι συνέτυχε περιψυχθέντων (copied by Galen *hist. philos.* 126 = *D D G* 646, 1/2); cf. also Plato *Tim.* 76 D. Probably Tert. in this passage follows Plin. *n. h.* 11, 247: *ungues clausulae nervorum summae existimantur... defuncto crescunt*.

It may be this passage which induced Junius rightly to replace *exordia* by *exodia*, a subst. found in Varro *Men.* 99. 174. 520 Büch. and in *res.* 25 (61, 14): *in exodio saeculi* (Jun.; *exordio* MSS; cf. *ib.* 1. 25: *sub omni clausula temporum*). The reading of *exordia* cannot be supported by such passages as *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1: *oculorum exordia* or Cael. Aurel. *morb. acut.* 3, 4, 27: *gutturis exordium quod Graeci anthereona vocant.* — *Comae . . . cerebro*: Arist. *de part. anim.* 2, 14 (658b 2 *seqq.*): τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνθρωπός ἐστι τῶν ζώων δασύτατον, ἐξ ἀνάγκης μὲν διὰ τὴν ὑγρότητα τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου καὶ διὰ τὰς ῥαφάς (ὅπου γὰρ ὑγρὸν καὶ θερμὸν πλεῖστον, ἐνταῦθ' ἀναγκαῖον πλείστην εἶναι τὴν ἔκφυσιν); *de generat. anim.* 5, 3 (782b 17/8); *problem.* 2, 10 (867a 25/7). A harmful effect of hairtonics on the brain is discussed by Tert. in *cult. fem.* 2, 6, 2. — *quod . . . praestat*: to my knowledge, an *accus. c. infin.* attached to *praestare* is found nowhere else; the verb is followed by an *infin.* in *adv. Herm.* 8 (135, 4/5); Apul. *met.* 4, 1; Petr. Chrysol. *serm.* 147 (595 B). — *secreta munitio*: the protected situation of the brain is emphasized by Plato *Tim.* 76 D. — *capillago*: ἀ. λ. — *deserit* is equivalent here to *deficit*; cf. Löfst., *Eran.* 10 (1910), 181/2 and Thes. 1. L. V, 1: 683, 1 *seqq.* (there, however, many passages are quoted where this meaning does not occur, e. g. 53, 4). From Tert. cf. *adv. Val.* 10 (188, 15): *ut vires deserebant* and *pall.* 2, 6: *alibi stipantem (= se st.) copiam, alibi deserentem* (see my interpretation of this place in *Mnemos.* III, 9 (1940), 132). The passage under discussion furnishes the clearest instance of this use of *deficere* together with Firm. Mat. *math.* 4, 1, 5: *humanum corpus luna deficiente deserit* (*decrescit* Kroll).

4. An *accus. c. inf.* attached to *est* is not found before Tert. (Hofm., *Synt.*, 583; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 47); cf. 47, 3. — *decessurum quandoque*: likewise, *ad Scap.* 5: *homines sunt, et ipsi morituri quandoque.* — *totam corporis scenam*: τὴν τοῦ σώματος σκηνήν. The designation of the body as *σκηνή* is seldom found (frequently only in the works of Methodius: *res.* 2, 21, 1. 2. 4; *sympos.* 9, 2 (241); 9, 3 (243. 246); 9, 4 (252); *contra Porphy.* 1, 2, etc.); on the other hand, *σκήνος* is often found in this context from [Hippocr.] *Περὶ καρδίας* 7 and Π. *ἀνατομῆς* (VIII, 538 Littré) downwards; cf. Democrit. B 37: τὰ ψυχῆς ἀγαθὰ . . . τὰ σκήνεος; *ib.* 57. 187. 223. 270. 288. This word is especially frequent in works containing 'Pythagorean' doctrines, e. g. Ocell. Lucan. frag. 1 Harder; [Tim. Locr.] Π. *ψυχ. κοσμ.* 100 A; 101 C. E, etc.; [Plato] *Axioch.* 366 A; moreover, cf. Aeschines *dial.* 3, 5 and Eurysus frag. 1 (II, 112 Müllach), and from medical literature Aretaeus *de caus. morb. chron.* 1, 15, 113. In the LXX it occurs in Sap. 9, 15: τὸ γεῶδες σκήνος (Vulg.: *terrena inhabitatio*), in the NT in 2 Cor. 5, 1. 4. In Christian literature it becomes a very common expression, especially in the works of Clem. Alex., Orig., and Greg. Nyss.; from pagan literature cf. *Corp. Herm.* 13, 15; *Epigr. Karbel*, 711; [Longin.] *de subl.* 32, 5; Maxim. Tyr. *diss.* 2, 3; Porphy. *de abstin.* 4, 9. Besides *σκήνος* we also frequently find *σκήνωμα* with the same meaning, e. g. Κόρη κόσμου (Stob. I 49, 44, p. 396 Wachsm.); 2 Petr. 1, 13; *ep. ad*

Diogn. 6, 8; Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 2, 25, 6; 3, 31, 2; *Acta Thom.* 23; *Apoc. Sedrach* 9; *Testam. Iob* 43). See also Wetstein's note on 2 Cor. 5, 1 (*Nov. Test.* II (Amst. 1752), p. 188); Anton, *De orig. lib.* π. ψυχ. κοσμ. (Numburg. 1891), 270 seqq.; Reitz., *Myster.*, 355; Wendland, Götting. gel. Anz. 172 (1910), 657; H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 158; Bauer's note on Joh. 1, 14 (*Hdb. N. T.* 6, p. 24); Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 341₅. — *superfluo*: as a subst. meaning 'remainder' (also in 53, 5) this word is especially frequent in juridical literature, e. g. Papin. *dig.* 36, 1, 60, 8. It is not clear who Tert. has in view here; the argument may have been brought forward by certain Christians against cremation (we may, however, also reckon with the Pythagoreans, cf. Jamblich. *Vit. Pyth.* 154: κατακτείν δὲ οὐκ εἶα τὰ σώματα τῶν τελευτησάντων). — *istius = huius* (see comm. on 1, 1) = *nostrae, Christianae*. — *adulatrix*: Tp, as also *aversatrix*. Note the varying of dat. and gen. in *reliquiis . . . crudelitatis*, for which cf. the passages collected by Thörn., *Stud. Tert.*, 1, 10/1, e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 16, 10: *materia incesti subministratur . . . occasio casibus aperitur*; for further details, see Sörbom, 77/8; Sjögren, *Comm. Tull.*, 86/7; Wahlén, 127; Pettersson, 162₂. — *quod et ipsum homo*: ὁ καὶ αὐτὸ ἄνθρωπος ὄν; see comm. on 5, 4. For the contents of the sentence, cf. *res.* 32 (71, 26/7): *tam enim corpus homo quam et anima*, and comm. on 35, 6; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (324, 8 seqq.): *quid est autem homo aliud quam caro, siquidem nomen hominis materia corporalis, non animalis, ab auctore sortita est?* (≈ Gen. 2, 7); for the opposite view that man is no more than his νοῦς, see Jaeger, *Arist.*, 256₁; cf. also *St. V. F.* 1, frag. 538; Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 257. — *exitu = exitio*, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 73. — The use of *impendi = deleri* (seldom found in this sense, not before Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 132/3) is to be considered a Grecism (δαπανᾶω = διαφθεῖρω, e. g. Plut. *Galba* 17 and Appian. *bell. civ.* 5, 79). For Tert.'s aversion from cremation, cf. 33, 5 and *res.* 1 (25, 9 seqq.), for the Christian view in general, Achelis, 1, 121.

5. *indivisibilis* (Tp), *ut immortalis*: see 14, 1. — *etiam . . . credi*: this argument may be due to Lucr. 3, 714/6 (see the preface to ch. 53): *quod si lincuntur* (sc. semina animai corpore in exanimo) *et insunt, haut erit ut merito immortalis possit haberi* (sc. anima), *partibus amissis quoniam libata recessit*. — *superfluo*: see comm. on § 4. Cf. also Sen. *Troad.* 401: *mors individua est*.

6. *De meo*: as usual the discussion is concluded by a 'purely Christian' argument. — *vernaculam ecclesiae*: after *vernaculus* a genit. is found from Plin. *n. h.* 14, 25 downwards (Colum. 3, 8, 5; Apul. *apol.* 18 = 21, 18). — *aetate integra*: this combination is found from Plaut. *Pseud.* 203 and Ter. *Andr.* 72: *egregia forma atque aetate integra* downwards; see Thes. I. L. I: 1127, 26/32. — *cum in pace dormisset*: one of the earliest instances of this very common formula; cf. also *exh. cast.* 1, 1/2: *post uxorem in pace* (Kroym. wrongly *in pacem*) *praemissam*; *mon.* 10: *in pace praemisisti virum tuum?* Cf. C. M. Kaufmann, *Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Paxformel* (Der Katholik 1896 II,

385/97). — **morante adhuc sepultura**: according to Th. Klauser, *Die Cathedra im Totenkult der heidn. u. christl. Antike* (Münster i. W. 1927), 127/8, the miracle described in this passage took place at the funeral, for he quotes this sentence in proof of the assertion that the priest or bishop said special prayers at the grave; he also refers to Aug. *confess.* 9, 12: *nam neque in eis precibus, quas tibi fudimus, quum tibi offerretur pro ea* (sc. Monnica) *sacrificium pretii nostri iam iuxta sepulcrum posito cadavere, priusquam deponeretur, sicut illic fieri solet, nec in eis precibus ego fleui*. However, though the words *morante adhuc sepultura* and *interim* do not interfere with this interpretation, it becomes fairly difficult to explain *componeretur* in this case, the usual sense of *componi* in this context being 'to be placed on a bier' (e. g. Pers. 3, 104; Stat. *silv.* 5, 1, 228; see Thes. l. L. III: 2116,36/41). Still it is possible that we should interpret *componere* in a different way by referring to passages from pagan literature where it denotes the composing of the body on the couch which was put on the pyre, e. g. Ovid *met.* 9, 503/4: *toroque / mortua componar, positaque det oscula frater*; in this case the verb in this passage denotes a similar action at a Christian funeral. Klauser's interpretation is also supported by the consideration that the miracle would have made a much greater impression if it had happened at the funeral than if it had taken place at the house of the dead woman. — **oratione**: according to Hoppe, *Synt.*, 32, we see here 'a freer use of the absol. ablat.'; since, however, the other instances quoted by him are of a totally different kind, it seems preferable to interpret *oratione* as an ablat. denoting attendant circumstances. — **halitum** must be retained, though no parallels can be adduced. — **condita pace**: Hoppe, *Gnom.* 11 (1935), 254, translates *pax* in this passage by 'prayer', probably on account of the preceding words *ad primum halitum orationis*; the same interpretation is given by Teeuwen, 66. However, the correct translation is 'kiss of peace', as was rightly pointed out by Dölger, *ACh* 5 (1936), 120/1. From pagan literature cf. Ovid *met.* 9, 504 (see the preceding note) and Tibull. 1, 1, 61/2: *flebis et arsumo positum me, Delia, lecto, tristibus et lacrimis oscula mixta dabis*. Concerning Christian funerals Klauser, 128₁₀₇ quotes the following passages: Ambros. *de exc. fratr. Satyr.* 1, 78: *procedamus ad tumulum, sed prius ultimum coram populo vale dico, pacem praedico, osculum solvo*; [Dionys.] *de eccles. hierarch.* 8, 80 (P. G. 3, 564): *Τελέσας γὰρ αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν εὐχὴν) ὁ ἱεράρχης, αὐτὸς τε ἀσπάζεται τὸν κεκοιμημένον, καὶ ἐξῆς οἱ παρόντες ἅπαντες*; Concil. Autissiodor. (585 A. D.), *can.* 12: *non licet mortuis nec eucharistiam nec osculum tradi*; for further details about this meaning of *pax*, see Linderbauer, 380; Blomgren, *Stud. Fortun.*, 1, 188/9; cf. also *Did. apostol.* 74, 3 Hauler and Paulin. Petrocor. *de vit. Mart.* 2, 632. 637. Of the expression *condita pace* different interpretations have been given. According to Rigaltius (who also regards *pax* as equivalent to *osculum pacis*), *condita* means 'con-data', 'mutuo data', which of course is absurd. Dölger, *loc. cit.*, regards *pacem condere* as strictly equivalent to the expression *pacem facere* (εἰρηνοποιεῖν) = *osculum pacis dare*, which occurs in *Pass. Perpet.* 12, 6; Cypr. *ep.* 64, 4;

Greg. Turon. *hist. Franc.* 6, 40, etc. (see also V. Schultze, art. 'Friedenskuss', Herzog-Hauck³ VI, 274). La Cerda gives the following paraphrase: "absolutis finitisque precibus quas sacerdos, ut mulieri mortuae pacem a Deo impetraret, fuderat". Though this interpretation is wrong with regard to the meaning of *pax*, La Cerda is right in considering *condita* equivalent to *finita*. The kiss of peace is frequently mentioned as concluding prayers; cf. e. g. Justin *apol.* 1, 65, 2: ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν; [Clem.] *ad virgin.* 2, 2, 5: *Post haec preces fundimus et nobis damus osculum pacis*; Tert. *orat.* 18 (191, 12/3): *osculum pacis quod est signaculum orationis*; we may especially refer to the passage just quoted from [Dionys.] *de eccles. hierarch.* A curious parallel is furnished by Pass. *Perpet.* 21, 7, where the kiss of peace forms the conclusion of the *martyrium*: *ante iam osculati invicem, ut martyrium per sollemnia pacis consummarent*. Thus we suppose that *pacem condere* is not equivalent to *pacem facere*, but has a pregnant sense, viz. "*preces* (or perhaps *funus*, which amounts to the same thing) *condere* (= finire) *pace facta* (soluta)". Many instances of similar expressions may be quoted, e. g. Cic. *orat.* 122 (see Kroll's note) *perorationem . . . concludere* = *peroratione orationem concludere*; by far the best parallel, however, is furnished by *lustrum condere*, which expression in the classical period must have been regarded as equivalent to *censuram lustrum condere* (for the original meaning, see R. Münsterberg, *Wien. Stud.* 24 (1902), 352/4).

7. *relatio*, etc.: likewise, the body of St. Laurence is said to have made room for the body of St. Stephen, when it was placed in the same crypt ('*la cripta della confessione*') of *S. Lorenzo fuori le mura*. We may also refer to a story related by Gregor. Turon. in *gloria confess.* 41: when a certain senator named Hilarius was entombed by the side of his wife, his body came to life again and embraced the body of his wife. — *accessui* must be the original reading. Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 3, 82) tries to retain *accessu* (A B), which is impossible, for Tert. never has a dat. ending in -u; see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 19/20 (a dat. *accessu* is found in Apul. *de mundo* 34 (170, 9 Thom.) and Amm. Marc. 29, 1, 20; in *Anthol. Lat.* 653, 22 the reading given by the manuscript, viz. *quae non accessus via sit temptanda*, seems to be preferable to Luc. Müller's conjecture *accessu*). — *solacium*: see comm. on 7, 1. — *extraneis in testimonium*: cf. *spect.* 10 (12, 9/10): *ut iam hic ethnicis in testimonium cedat sententia ipsorum nobiscum faciens*. For the antithesis, cf. *apol.* 41, 4: *nobis . . . in admonitionem, vobis . . . in castigationem*; Pass. *Perpet.* 1, 5: *cum semper Deus operetur quae repromisit, non credentibus in testimonium, credentibus in beneficium*; Aug. *de trin.* 4, 17, 23: *ut veritas undique resonaret, fidelibus in adiutorium, impiis in testimonium* (Epiphan. *haer.* 51, 30, 1: εἰς μαρτύριον τοῖς ἀπίστουσιν). — *si . . . sed*: see comm. on 32, 9. — *in causam*: cf. the note on 38, 4. — *refrigerasset*: for the intransitive use of this verb, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 64; Medert, 82/3; Sverr., *Luc.*, 156.

8. *undeunde*: this conjecture by Scaliger (*unde* A B Gel) is necessary, though in numerous places the shorter form is given by manuscripts in similar cases. A survey of relevant passages is given by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 113₃, who refrains from deciding for himself, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 36 (545, 23/4): *qui quo<quo> modo ignoti habebantur* (*quoquo* Ursin. Kroyem.); together with *pud.* 14 (248, 19/20): *ut quo modo auferatur de medio eorum*, this passage was quoted by Baehrens to defend the reading of *quo* in *Paneg.* 11, 16: *illud vero, non suggeratur licet, quo modo dicam, antequam desinam* (however, in *pud.* 14, just as in *scorp.* 4 (153, 11), *quo* is almost certainly equivalent to *aliquo*). In several other passages not mentioned by Hoppe it is necessary to adopt the longer form, e. g. *ad nat.* 2, 12, 6: *erant unde<unde>, caelibes diu et orbi* (*unde* A; *undeunde* Oehl. Borleffs); *paen.* 3, 16: *quaqua te constitueris, crimine adstringeris* (*quaqua te* Latin. Borleffs; *qua te* T; *qua te qua* N; *quaque te* rell.); *adv. Marc.* 3, 9 (391, 11); *ib.* 4, 33 (532, 14). Some cases are doubtful, e. g. *Apul. de deo Socr.* 20 (29, 14 Thom.): *verum enimvero, ut<ut> ista sunt* (*utut* Stewechius, *ut* ω), where Thomas refers to *apol.* 43 (50, 11 Helm): *verum enimvero, ut ista sese habent*; *id., met.* 11, 20 (281, 21 Helm); *Arnob.* 5, 9. — *signis . . . et ostentis*: the same combination is found in *scorp.* 2 (148, 21/2): *et dederit tibi signum vel ostentum* (*Deuter.* 13, 1; *s. atque portentum* Vulg.) and *adv. Marc.* 5, 16 (631, 8). — *naturam* = *formam naturalem*, cf. 45, 3: *et natura de forma*; 26, 4; 52, 1. 2. — *Mors . . . non est*: this formulation may be due to *adv. Marc.* 1, 3 (293, 16): *deus si non unus est, non est. — remanserit . . . est*: for the *variatio modorum*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 66. Tert. probably intended to write *erit* (cf. *miscebitur*), but wrote *est* on account of the clausula. For the pleonastic use of *et*, see comm. on 1,6.

52. *Since death is always violent, there is no necessity to distinguish between an 'ordinary' and an 'extraordinary' kind of death.*

"It is now clear that we may define death as the complete separation of body and soul. However, human sentiment takes a further step by distinguishing between two kinds of death: the 'ordinary' kind, i. e. peaceful death, which is regarded as natural, and the 'extraordinary' form, i. e. violent death, which is generally considered to be contrary to nature (§ 1). In refutation of this, we Christians may point out that death does not proceed from nature, but from the sin of Adam and Eve, and that their sin did not spring from nature either (§ 2). There is no kind of death that is not violent; even when somebody dies from joy or in his sleep, death, inasmuch as it separates two closely connected substances such as body and soul, must be qualified as violent (§ 3). When a vessel is shipwrecked without any visible external cause, we call it a violent ending; in the same way a peaceful form of death is to be regarded as a 'shipwreck of the body' (§ 4)".

According to 53, 1, Soranus (who is certainly meant by the word *medicis*; see the note on 13, 2) had discussed the *rationes* of the various kinds of death; moreover, the antithesis *κατὰ φύσιν — παρὰ φύσιν*

played a highly important part in his works (see Introduction, p. 36₁*), so that we may be justified in supposing that this chapter is due to a passage from Περὶ ψυχῆς. Nevertheless, the discussion found here, which is again based on the *forma primordii* (§ 2), is to be regarded as of Tert.'s own finding. It is not possible to state with certainty the source of the examples quoted in § 3; two of them may have been borrowed from Plin. *n. h.*, whereas the remaining two were perhaps taken from a miracle-book.

1. *separatio carnis atque animae*: repeated from 51, 1. — *seposita*: Tert. frequently uses this part. in an *ablat. absolut.*: *adv. Marc.* 2, 13 (352, 15); *ad nat.* 1, 2, 8; *iei.* 10 (287, 14); *adv. Val.* 4 (181, 20). — *fatorum*: Reifferscheid's conjecture *factorum* is certainly wrong, for Tert. refers to the distinction between *mors fatalis* (Thes. l. L. VI: 333, 51/5) and *fortuita* (*ib.* 1173, 22/3; *Amm. Marc.* 22, 15, 18); for the antithesis *fatum-fortuna*, cf. 20, 5. — *humanus affectus*: 'sentiment of mankind' (also in *Aug. civ. dei* 1, 17, 31). — *ordinariam . . . iudicans*: for this distinction, cf. *Gell.* 13, 1 (θάνατος *naturalis et fatalis*, θάνατος *extrinsecus vi coactus*); see also Norden, *Verg. Aen. VI*³, 12/3 and *Agn. Theos*, 277₂; *Cumont, Mag. Hellén.*, 1, 182; preface to ch. 56. *Add S H A Heliogabal.* 1, 3: *illi . . . exitu naturali functi sunt, hi vero interfecti*. — *violenti cuiusque finis*: see 57, 1 for the *biaeothanati*.

2. *Qui . . . novimus*: once more Tert. returns to *Genesis*; cf. the note on 9, 7. — *culpa . . . naturali*, i. e. the *concupiscentia* of Adam and Eve, which was not natural, for (38, 3) *proprie naturalis concupiscentia unica est alimentorum solummodo*. — *facile . . . adhaesisse*: cf. 16, 1: *ipsum illud transgressionis admissum . . . inoleverit et coadoleverit in anima ad instar iam naturalitatis, quia statim in naturae primordio accidit*; 20, 6; 41, 1: *naturae corruptio alia natura est*; *adv. Marc.* 2, 6 (342, 2/4): *ut ergo bonum iam suum haberet homo, . . . et fieret proprietas iam boni in homine et quodammodo natura*. Cf. also *Priscillian. can.* 28 (122, 13/4 Schepss): *voluntas carnis quae ex consuetudine lex iam dicitur atque natura*. — *videntur . . . adhaesisse* may be regarded as a pleonasm; cf. the note on 1, 1. — *ex accidentia*, i. e. *eo quod ad substantiam accesserunt*; cf. the comm. on 11, 4 and 25, 4. — *directo*: a law term frequently found in Tert.'s works (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 1256, 21 *seqq.*). — *non in mortem institutum eum*: cf. *adv. Marc.* 2, 8 (345, 2 *seqq.*): *ita non in mortem institutum hominem probat qui <et> nunc cupit in vitam restitutum, malens peccatoris paenitentiam quam mortem. igitur sicut deus homini vitae statum induxit, ita homo sibi mortis statum adtrahit*. — *condicionali*: again one of the law terms which in this passage are particularly numerous (≈ *lex*); *cond. comminatio* is also found in *adv. Marc.* 3, 23 (417, 24; = *adv. Iud.* 13, 171/2); *scorp.* 8 (161, 20): *condicionales . . . minas*. — *suspendens*: Kellner translates: "das sich in der Schwebe hält", but *suspendens* does not have intransitive sense (this sense is only found in *pall.* 3, 3: *vix a terra suspendit* (sc. *chamaeleon*) and in *carm. de resurr. mort.* 55: *solidam verbo iussit* (sc. *dominus*) *suspendere terram*, cf. my note);

the parallelism (*condicionali . . . suspendens, arbitrio . . . addicens*) requires the words *mortis eventum* to be connected with both *suspendens* and *addicens*. The meaning is: 'to leave undecided', as for instance in Liv. 39, 29, 1: *itaque medio responso rem suspenderunt*, Min. Fel. 14, 5, and frequently in juridical literature (cf. Goelzer, *Avit.*, 582₁); for the whole sentence, cf. Vitton, 49. — *eventum*: see the note on 2, 1. — *oblationis* is the correct reading; Tert. distinguishes between "the free choice (*potestas*) of the offer" (i. e. the free choice, permitted by the possibility offered <to sin or not to sin>) and the binding *auctoritas* of the *institutum*, the established legal prescription, which would leave no margin for the *libertas arbitrii*. *oblatio* (from Apul. *met.* 10, 5 downwards, cf. Cooper, 11; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 73) is mostly used by Tert. in the sense of 'offering'; in *apol.* 2, 9 it is equivalent to *delatio*. Cf. H. Janssen, *Kult. u. Sprache*, 106. 229; Schrijn., *Charakt.*, 38; d'Alès, *Théol.*, 309. The verbal sense occurring in the present passage is rarely found, and seems to belong to the domain of the law (e. g. Ulpian. *dig.* 5, 2, 8, 10). — *per voluntatem . . . per necessitatem*: the same antithesis is found in *adv. Marc.* 2, 6 (342, 14/5. 22/3), which chapter strongly influenced the present passage.

3. *exitus mortis* = *eventus mortis* (§ 2). — *nullum . . . agatur*: a striking parallel is found in Aug. *civ. dei* 13, 6 (Aug. may have had this passage in mind): *Quapropter quod adinet ad corporis mortem, id est separationem animae a corpore, cum eam patiuntur qui morientes appellantur, nulli bona est. Habet enim asperum sensum et contra naturam vis ipsa qua utrumque divellitur, quod fuerat in vivente coniunctum atque consertum, quamdiu moratur, donec omnis adimatur sensus, qui ex ipso inerat animae carnisque complexu.* — *operatrix*: see the note on 11, 4. — *societatem*: 37, 5: *societatem carnis atque animae*; 38, 1; 40, 1; 58, 4; cf. the comm. on 5, 5: *socii vigoris*. — *sorum substantiarum*: cf. e. g. Philo *de ebriet.* 70: τὸ ψυχῆς ἀδελφὸν σώμα; Prud. *Hamart.*, praef. 56: *caro in sororem tela mentem dirigit*; from Tert.'s works cf. *res.* 63 (124, 21/2): *nemo magis frater tuus (sc. animae) quam quae tecum etiam in deo nascitur (sc. caro)*. For the use of *soror* as an adjunct., cf. *de pallio* 1, 2: *soror civitas*; a somewhat different case occurs in *apol.* 12, 2: *materias sorores vasculorum instrumentorumque communium* (see Waltz., *comm.*, 95). — *prae*: see the comm. on 2, 2. — *Chilon*: Tert. seems to follow Plin. *n. h.* 7, 119: *quin et funus eius (sc. Chilonis), cum victore filio Olympiae expirasset gaudio, tota Graecia prosecuta est.* — *ob . . . praestantiam*: a highly disputed passage. A B have *ab historicis diu praestantium*, which Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 87/8) tries to retain by interpreting *historicus* as *histrionicus*, a meaning found in Comedian. *instr.* 2, 16, 22 (but nowhere else: Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 97; Thes. 1. L. VI, 3: 2842, 11/3; at the end of his discussion Hartel questions the possibility of this interpretation and proposes to read *historicis ludis*, which is completely enigmatic). But undoubtedly we must assume that *historicus* has its usual sense here, for Tert. mentions Clidemus, the earliest author of an Ἀτθίς (see Jacoby, *R. E.* XI: 591/3). Since it is highly improbable that historiographers

should come together to crown one of their number, it is impossible to retain the reading given by A B. Such honours were certainly given by the state: we may quote the gift of ten talents to Herodotus (Plut. *de Herod. malign.* 26), on whom this official honour was bestowed for the way in which he had praised Attica in his work; for the author of an Ἀτθίς a similar distinction is still more probable. We may assume that the words *ob . . . praestantium* contain the reason why Clidemus was crowned with a gold wreath; hence Oehler's conjecture *ob historici stili praestantiam* seems to be right (Reifferscheid's emendation *ob historiarum praestantiam* diverges too strongly from the traditional reading). The reading found in A B may be due to an erroneous *ab* instead of *ob*, which in its turn may have given rise to a wrong division of the words, viz. *historicis tili (>diu). historicus stilus* certainly does not mean 'historical style' or 'his style as a historian' (for this meaning, cf. Macrob. Sat. 5, 14, 11: *ut . . . historicum stilum vitet non per ordinem digerendo quae gesta sunt*; Serv. in Aen. 8, 493), but 'liber historicus', for Tert. frequently uses *stilus* in the sense of *liber*, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (618, 1/2): '*De paradiso* suus *stilus est* ('is a special book')'; *ib.* 1, 1 (290, 12); *res.* 2 (28, 13/4). — *per somnium*, ut Plato: since, according to Suidas s. v. Πλάτων (cf. Wilam., *Platon*, 1, 720), Plato died in his sleep, and Tert. himself regards dreams as *non modicae iactationes animae* (45, 1), it might seem preferable to read *somnum*, the more so, because this word corresponds to *requie* in the next sentence; on the other hand, this chapter contains an error (see the next note) which shows that once more Tert. is inaccurate here. It is also possible that he had in mind another passage from Plato's biography, viz. the fact recorded by Olympiodor. *Vit. Plat.* 6 (Albin. *Proleg.* 1): μέλω τῶν τελευτῶν ἐνούπιον εἶδεν, ὥς κύκνος γενόμενος ἀπὸ δένδρου εἰς δένδρον μετέρχεται, or that he mixed up these two notes. A similar case is mentioned by Plin. *n. h.* 7, 138: *supremo somnio eius* (sc. Sullae), *cui immortalis quodammodo est*. — *per risum*, ut P. Crassus: according to Groebe (in: Drumann, *Geschichte Roms*, 4², 82₁₂), the father of the *triumvir* is meant; Münzer (art. 'Licinius' 57, R. E. XIII: 269/70) has shown that the *praenomen* is wrong, for Tert. means M. Licinius Crassus the grandfather who, according to Lucilius (1299/1300 Marx; cf. Cic. *fin.* 5, 92 and *Tusc.* 3, 31; Macrob. *Sat.* 2, 1, 6; Amm. Marc. 26, 9, 11; Hier. *ep.* 7, 5 and 130, 13, 2; *adv. Rufin.* 1, 30; Eugen. Tolet. *carm.* 87 Vollm.; for further particulars, see Münzer, *loc. cit.*; add [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu 115, 75), had only once laughed in all his life (according to Plin. *n. h.* 7, 79 (Solin. 1, 72), he had never laughed at all). Münzer rightly remarks that only by combining the fragment of Lucilius with the present passage Lucilius' joke can be understood: "Crassus never used to laugh, so that, when he did so for the first time, it caused his death". — *mors . . . grassatur*: cf. Sulpic. Sever. *chron.* 1, 21, 2: *tum vero catervatim in eos grassata mors est*; Hilar. in Ps. 68, 4; Mar. Merc. *Nest. adv. Pelag.* p. 62, 30 S.; Cassiod. in Ps. 118, 17 (Thes. l. l. VI, 2: 2202, 76/80). *per aliena*: "through things that are alien <to its being>"; cf. e. g. Tac. *Agric.* 46, 3: *forma mentis aeterna*,

quam tenere et exprimere non per alienam materiam et artem, sed tuis ipse moribus possis (see for this passage, Persson, *Bemerk. zu Tac. kl. Schr.*, 84). — **iocundius**, not *iucundius* (A) must be read; *in iocunditate* is found in *adv. Marc.* 4, 14 (461, 22); cf. Rönsch, *It.*, 465 (in 1, 6, *per habitum iocunditatis*, we have only *B Gel* at our disposal). — **in exultatione . . . in voluptate**: the parallelism is consistently maintained: *in ex.-prae gaudio*, *in hon.-prae gloria*, *in requie-per somnium*, *in voluptate-per risum*. The reading *requite* (A) instead of *requie* must be due to the succeeding *voluptate*.

4. The accident instanced in this paragraph was a much-discussed problem, as is evident from [Arist.] *problem.* 5, 23 (931b 39 *seqq.*): Διὰ τί ἐνίοτε πλοῦα θέοντα ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ εὐδίας καταπίνεται καὶ ἀφανῇ γίνεται ὥστε μηδὲ ναυάγιον ἀναπλεῖν. As to the style, cf. the still more rhetorical description given by Apul. *Flor.* 23 (43, 13/20 Helm): *sicut novem bonam, fabre factam, bene intrinsecus compactam, extrinsecus eleganter depictam, mobili clave, firmis rudentibus, procero malo, insigni carchesio, splendentibus velis, postremo omnibus armamentis idoneis ad usum et honestis ad contemplationem, eam navem si aut gubernator non agat aut tempestas agat, ut facile cum illis egregiis instrumentis aut profunda hauserint aut scopuli comminuerint.* — **Vis . . . navigiis**: these words were rightly interpreted by Thörnell (*Eran.* 7 (1907), 97/8) who gives the following paraphrase: “non solum turbulentiores navium interitus naufragia sunt, sed vis est et illa navigiis, etc.; bene cum his concinunt sequentia: *non secus naufragia sunt vitae etiam tranquillae mortis eventus*”. A shipwreck which is not due to an external cause, is a shipwreck all the same; similarly, a peaceful death is ‘a shipwreck of the body’ no less than a violent death. — **Caphereis** is the correct reading; it also occurs in Verg. *Aen.* 11, 260; Ovid *met.* 14, 472. 481. Cf. Thes. 1. L. Onom. II:1 56, 19 (where the note on the present passage ‘*mapereis codd.*’ is incorrect). The *Capherea saxa* are frequently mentioned in Latin poetry from Pacuv. *trag.* 136 downwards. — **depugnata**: the transitive use of this verb is rarely found (Thes. 1. L. V 1: 618, 17 quotes Ulp. *dig.* 3, 1, 1, 6; 48, 8, 11, 2; *Gramm. Lat.* VI 633, 23 Keil; Cael. Aurelian. *morb. chron.* 1, 4, 106, Enn. *ann.* 105 should be excised). — **decumanis**: only Tert. uses this word as a subst. (also in *pall.* 2, 2). The *decumanus* (or *decimus*) *fluctus* was regarded as the most dangerous, cf. e. g. Ovid. *met.* 11, 530: *vastius insurgens decimae ruit impetus undae*; Thes. 1. L. V 1: 170, 9 *seqq.* — **adulante flatu**: cf. e. g. Plin. *n. h.* 17, 10: *si blandiantur austri*; Tiberian. *carm.* 1, 4: *blandiente sibilo (sc. aurae)*. — **percussu**: a ἄ. λ., which of course is due to rhyme. — **cum tota securitate**: Apul. *loc. cit.*: *cum illis egregiis instrumentis; fuga* 5, 3: *Rutilius cum totiens fugisset . . . post totam securitatem . . . apprehensus.* — **naufragia . . . vitae**: Amm. Marc. 30, 8, 8: *per alienae vitae naufragia*; Ambros. *de bono mort.* 8, 31: *denique iustis mors quietis est portus, nocentibus naufragium putatur.* Tert. frequently mentions shipwrecks metaphorically, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 201. For the use made of this metaphor in Greek philosophy, see Gerhard, *Phoinix*

von Kolophon, 98 seqq.; Dibelius' note on 1 Tim. 1, 19 (*Hdb. N. T.* 13, p. 21). — *Nihilo refert*: cf. the note on 25, 2: *nulla interest*. — *corporis . . . navigatio*: cf. *Lactant. div. instit.* 3, 20, 14: *sic . . . navis sine gubernatore ablit pessum et corpus relictum ab anima diffluit*. This metaphor is a very common one from Plato *Phaedr.* 247 C downwards, where the νοῦς is qualified as the κυβερνήτης τῆς ψυχῆς (similarly, e. g. *Corp. Herm.* 10, 21; 12, 4; *Plut. de ser. num. vind.* 563 E; *de exilio* 601 F; for Philo, cf. Leisegang's index s.v. κυβ.); it refers to the relation between body and soul in *Arist. de anim.* 2, 1 (413a 8/9); *Max. Tyr.* 40, 5; *Plotin.* 1, 1, 3; 3, 4, 6; 4, 3, 17. 21; *Acta Archelai* 22, 6/7, etc. See also Windisch's note on *Jac.* 3, 4 (*Hdb. N. T.* 15, p. 22), and, for the still more widely-spread qualification of God as helmsman of the world, Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 210. — *dum* (B), not *cum* (A), is the correct reading. Thörnell (*op. cit.*, 98) refers to *spect.* 6 (8, 13 seqq.): *sed de idololatria nihil differt apud nos, sub quo nomine et titulo, dum ad eosdem spiritus perveniat, quibus renuntiamus; ad nat.* 1, 14, 4: *neque enim interest qua forma, dum deformia simulacra curemus*. Also *res.* 30 (68, 6/7): *nihil mea interest, dum sit et corporum resurrectio; spect.* 5 (7, 4): *nihil iam de causa vocabuli, dum rei causa idololatria sit* (*dum* A Isidor. Oehl.; *quin* B; *cum* Pam. Rfd).

53. *The lingering form of death is not to be regarded as an argument in favour of the mortality of the soul.*

"I must leave a description of the various forms of death to the physicians (§ 1); yet I want to say something about the lingering form of death, when the soul leaves the body gradually and piece by piece, because this may suggest that the soul is wasting away; but in this case every explanation must take the body as its starting-point (§ 2). For when in the body the vital organs are gradually destroyed, the soul is forced to depart slowly, and in doing so it seems to waste away; in like manner we say that a charioteer's strength decreases, when in reality this is what happens to his horses (§ 3). Thus the soul slowly withdraws from the body, but without being disintegrated: its continuity is left intact (§ 4). This is the reason why people on their death-bed often have second sight: for that part of the soul which is already outside the body, sees everything more clearly and communicates this by means of the part still lingering in the body. The body obscures the clear sight of the soul (§ 5) which, as soon as it is set free, beholds its own true light (§ 6)".

This chapter is directed against those who assert that the soul is disintegrated at death. This statement cannot refer to the popular view mentioned by Plato in the *Phaedo* (70 A; 77 B. D., 84 B), which assumes that the soul immediately after leaving the body is dispersed ὥπερ πνεῦμα ἡ καπνός (cf. also *Plut. de sera num. vind.* 560 C and *Sap. Salom.* 2, 3); it can only refer to a theory supposing this to take place at the moment of death itself. Such a view was upheld by Epicurus. Cf. frag. 337: ἔξεισι (viz. ψυχῇ) μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐκβαίνειν διαφορεῖται καὶ διασχεδάννυται

(it is almost certain that Epicurus here follows Democritus; cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 190₂); *ep.* 1 (p. 21, 8 Usen.): λυομένου τοῦ ὅλου ἀθροίσματος ἡ ψυχὴ διασπείρεται (Sext. Empir. *adv. mathem.* 9, 72 (Epic. frag. 337 Usen.): καθ' αὐτὰς διαμένουσι (viz. αἱ ψυχαί) καὶ οὐχ, ὥς ἔλεγεν ὁ Ἐπίκουρος, ἀπολυθεῖσαι τῶν σωμάτων καπνοῦ δίκην σκίδναιται seems to mix up reminiscences of the *Phaedo* and notes about Epicurus). It seems highly probable that the exposition given in this chapter is directed against Lucretius who gives a particularly circumstantial account of the slow disintegration of the soul at death (3, 526/47); cf. e. g. 526/7: *denique saepe hominem paulatim cernimus ire / et membratim vitalem deperdere sensum*; 531/2: *scinditur atqui animae haec quoniam natura nec uno / tempore sincera existit, mortalis habenda est* (this is the very view which Tert. combats in this passage); 539: *dilaniata foras dispergitur* (so the soul is dispersed in corpore, Tert. § 2), *interit ergo*; 546/7: *quando hominem totum magis ac magis undique sensus / deficit et vitae minus et minus undique restat*; with Tert.'s *paulatim ac minutatim* cf. Lucr. 530: *tractim* and particularly 542: *particulatim*. According to Lucretius, the soul departs through all the pores of the body (586/8; cf. Heinze, *Lucr. III*, p. 134/5); there it disappears (as in the passages quoted higher up) *ceu fumus* (437/9 and 455/8). A different refutation of this same passage, which must have been a well-known one, is found in Lactant. *div. inst.* 7, 12, 22/3: *iam illud argumentum multo magis inane est, quod ait (sc. Lucretius) animam, quia non citius emittatur ex corpore, mortalem videri, sed paulatim se ex omnibus membris explicet a summis pedibus incipiens: tamquam si esset aeterna, uno temporis momento erumperet, quod fit in iis qui ferro intereunt. quos autem morbus interimit, spiritum diutius exhalant, ut paulatim frigescentibus membris anima effletur.* (23) *Quae cum materia sanguinis contineatur sicut lumen oleo, ea materia febrium calore consumpta necesse est membrorum summa quaeque frigesce, quoniam venae exiliores in extrema corporis porriguntur et extremi ac tenuiores rivi deficiente vena fontis arescunt.* That a swift departure from the body was considered to be a sign of immortality, is shown by Lucr. 3, 612/4: *quod si immortalis nostra foret mens, / non tam se moriens dissolvi conquereretur, / sed magis ire foras, vestemque relinquere, ut anguis*, and by a passage from a much later period, viz. Cassian. *conlat.* 7, 3, 4: (anima) *ocius quam anguilla elabitur*.

According to Karpp, Tert. here, too, follows Soranus, but his arguments are not particularly strong. It is not true that this chapter is closely connected with the beginning of ch. 51 (cf. Introduction, p. 20*), and the reference to the physicians in § 1 touches upon subjects which Tert. omits; the mention of the 'Poretheorie' (if mentioned here at all) may rather be explained by Tert.'s reading of Lucretius than by his consulting a work of a physician from the methodic school, such as Soranus' *Περὶ ψυχῆς*.

1. For the use of *explosa*, cf. e. g. Cic. *offic.* 1, 6; *de fin.* 4, 47 and 5, 23. — *devertit* seems to be the correct reading, cf. 7, 4. In Thes.

1. L. V, 1: 856, 61/2 this passage is wrongly put under B 1 a: “se sive animum convertere ab aliqua re et ad aliquid faciendum vel dicendum”, for here the meaning is certainly ‘to put up’; a parallel occurs in *adv. Val.* 32 (208, 22): *illuc habeo devertere post excessum*. We must retain the present tense (A), cf. e. g. *adv. Prax.* 2 (230, 5/7): <qui> *quomodo numerum sine divisione patiuntur, procedentes tractatus demonstrabunt*. — *arbitris*: similarly, 25, 3: *nemo tam idoneus magister arbiter testis*.

2. For *Plane*, cf. 2, 1. — *interstruam*: not ‘I shall add’ (Hoppe, *Synt.*, 134), but ‘I shall insert’: after reading ch. 52 we expect a discussion of the question “where the soul will take up its residence after death”, but this discussion is deferred to ch. 54/5. The same sense of *interstruere* occurs in *adv. Marc.* 4, 39 (556, 16/7): *nullam hic poteris interstruere distinctionem* (here Hoppe gives the right interpretation ‘= *interponere*’) and *cor.* 10, 57/8; intrans.: *res.* 4 (30, 1/2): *haeretici inde statim incipiunt et inde praestruunt, dehinc interstruunt* (Kroymann alters the text). — *coniecturam . . . interitus*: the objective genit. after *coniectura* is very rare, cf. *Thes.* 1. s. v. Of, course we may not compare *Cic. divin.* 1, 58 *coniectura huius somnii* or *fin.* 2, 113: *inest coniectura consequentium, non multum a divinatione differens*, where the conjecture refers to the nature of the *consequentia*, and not, as in this passage, to the fact itself. The nearest parallel is furnished by the *coniectura voluntatis* (viz. of the *testator*) which is often mentioned in the *digesta* (e. g. 15, 1, 57, 2; 31, 78, 1; 33, 7, 12, 43; 35, 1, 102; 36, 2, 12, 5); cf. also *Cels. ib.* 24, 1, 47: *coniectura eius rei*. Hence it seems probable that we must take into account the influence of the idiom of lawyers. — *in corpore et ex corpore*: cf. 36, 1: *animam in ipso et ex ipso seri homine*. — *viarum vitalium . . . arteriarum*: the *venae* were thought to contain the blood, the *arteriae* the *spiritus animalis*, cf. e. g. *Iren. lat.* 5, 3, 2: *arteriae et venae, sanguinis et spiritus transitoria* and the note on 10, 7: *fistulis arteriarum*. *Via vitalis* is mostly used to denote the windpipe, e. g. *Ovid met.* 2, 828: *vitalisque vias et respiramina*; *Amm. Marc.* 30, 6, 3: *vitalique via voceque simul obstructa*; *vitalis semita* has the same sense in *Anthol. Lat.* 181, 7. Schümmer, *Fastenpraxis*, 22 wrongly quotes this passage to prove that Tert. among other things regarded the gall and the blood as the seat of the soul; Tert. only means to say that the soul must depart “because its dwelling dilapidates” (*dilapsa domo* 38, 6; the passage is to be regarded as a supplement to this paragraph). *viarum* does not denote the πόροι (as Karpp seems to suppose), but the *venae* and *arteriae*; in *Cael. Aurel.*, however, this sense of πόροι is really found (e. g. *acut. morb.* 2, 46).

3. *ex propria quaque* (*quaeque* Rfd) is the correct reading, cf. the note on 2, 4: *vera quaeque*. — *eversionem*: cf. 26, 4. *rescissionem*: a juridical term (e. g. *Callist. dig.* 50, 9, 5; *Ulp. ib.* 37, 4, 3, 5; 43, 24, 11, 13); it also occurs in *adv. Marc.* 2, 7 (344, 6): *in institutione an in rescissione*; *res.* 57 (117, 13). — *instrumentis . . . spatiis*: neither

these words nor the preceding ones (*finium situum officiorum*) are strictly parallel to the *materiae, regiones, and viae* (§ 2), as was supposed by La Cerda. — **migrare compulsa**: the inf. after *compellere*, which occurs from Ovid *fasti* 3, 860 downwards (Thes. l. L. III: 2034, 12 *seqq.*), is very common in Tert.'s works (cf. *ib.*). — **denegavit**: "has made incapable"; cf. the note on 25, 4: *cum . . . denegat* (sc. *infans*) *partum*. — **auriga corporis, spiritus animalis**: this very common metaphor is based on the representation of the mind as charioteer of the soul, an image probably borrowed by Plato from the Pythagoreans, *Phaedrus* 246 A: *ἐοικέτω δὴ (ἡ ψυχὴ) συμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου* (the inferior elements of the soul which together constitute the ὑπόπτερον ζεύγος are not considered by Tert. to form part of the essence of the soul; cf. 16, 1/2); *carm. aur.* 69: *ἡνιόχον γνῶμην στήσας καθύπερθεν ἀρίστην* (for this passage, cf. P. C. van der Horst, *Les vers d'or pythagoriciens* (Leiden 1932), 68/70; we may add many passages from Philo (see Leisegang's index s. v. ἡνιόχος); further e. g. Clem. Alex. *paedag.* 3, 11, 53, 2; *str.* 5, 8, 53, 1; *Method. resurr.* 3, 18, 1 and *sympos.* 1, 1 (the soul as ὄχημα); Porphyry. *de abstin.* 1, 43/4; for the Cappadocians, see Gronau, *Poseidonios*, 246). The conception of the soul as charioteer of the body, which is much less common, seems to hark back to Plato *Tim.* 69 C: *ὄχημά τε πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἔδωσαν* (sc. *τῇ ψυχῇ οἱ θεοί*); it occurs fairly often in the works of the Middle and Neoplatonists, e. g. Plut. *de Hom.* 122; Albin. *Isag.* 23; Jamblich. *ap. Stob. ecl.* 1, 371, 12 and 382, 2 Wachsm.; Maxim. Tyr. *diss.* 41, 5; Synes. *de insomn.* 137 A (cf. W. Lang, *Das Traumbuch des Synesios von Kyrene* (Tübingen 1926), 69/70); Procl. in *Plat. Remp.* 392, 1 B; Olympiodor. in *Pl. Phaed.* p. 241, 21 *sqq.* Norvin; from Latin literature cf. Colum. 3, 10, 9: *videmus hominibus inspiratam velut aurigam rectricemque membrorum animam*. It stands to reason that with Christian authors the latter conception is more popular, e. g. [Cypr.] *de bono pud.* 14 (25, 9 H.): (animus) *quasi legitimus ac perfectus auriga* (in Athenag. *de resurr.* 15 (66, 33/4 Schwartz) τὸ σῶμα . . . ταῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἡνίαις ὑπέκρινον καὶ χαλιναγωγούμενον the image of rider and horse is at the root of it, just as in Plut. *adv. Colot.* 21; hence the passages from Philo quoted by Schwartz in the index, p. 112/3, are irrelevant here); *Method. resurr.* 2, 22, 1; Euseb. *praep. evang.* 11, 38 (569 D); Hieron. *adv. Iovin.* 2, 10; Aug. *ep.* 13, 2; *de vera relig.* 45, 83; *serm.* ed. Denis. 2, 4: *corpus vehiculum, animus utens vehiculo, corpus quasi vehiculum quod regatur, animus auriga*; Ambros. *de Nabuthae* 15, 64; Greg. Nyss. *resurr.* 198 A (cf. Gronau, *loc. cit.*, 154₁); [Aug.] *Qu. V. et N. T.*, qu. 108; Potam. *de Lazaro* (P. L. 8, 1413 A). — **vectaculi**: τοῦ ὀχήματος. For the (αὐγοειδὲς) τῆς ψυχῆς ὄχημα, a conception which is very common in Neoplatonism (and is also found in Middle Platonism), cf. Überweg-Prächter, 629. Aug. in this context often uses *vehiculum*; cf. also Chalcid. *comm.* 217 M.: *animam esse animalium sanguinem, quia sit vehiculum irrationabilis animae. vectaculum* only occurs in two other places, viz. Gell. 20, 1, 30 (but *var. lect.*: *vectabulum*) and *bapt.* 3, 2: *solus liquor . . . dignum vectaculum deo subiciebat*. — **clanguens** is very rare too (Thes. l. L. V, 2: 322, 19/24 besides this

passage only adduces *Not. Tiron.* 112, 35 and Fulg. *Rusp. dub. serm.* 46). For the antithesis *actu . . . statu*, cf. the note on 11, 1. — *decoquens*: in *Thes. l. L. V.* 1: 204, 60/1 the present passage is put under the heading 'calore delere sim.', which is certainly wrong; the sense is: *minuens* (Blokhuis, 133/4 compares the similar use as an intransitive verb in *apol.* 42, 8: *templorum vectigalia cotidie decoquunt*) or *debilitans* (cf. *Thes. l. L.*, loc. cit., 205, 35/51, particularly *Novat. trin.* 23: *ne decoquerent in illo* (sc. Christo) *divini nominis potestatem, si humanam illi sociassent . . . nativitatem*; *Solin.* 27, 17; *Symmach. ep.* 9, 83, 2); from *Tert. cf. res.* 12 (41, 13/4): *ut etiam ampliet* (sc. terra), *prius decoquit*.

4. *Sic et* refers to the second part of the sentence (*at ubi longa mors*, etc.): "in the same way <as was the case with the charioteer whose horses became exhausted> the soul is left in the lurch by the body (which in its turn the soul leaves in the lurch), if death is long in coming, whereas the rapid form of death grants the soul no delay". The connection of the thoughts would have been clearer, if the words *rapida . . . discruciat* had formed a subordinate clause; add to this that at the end of the sentence *Tert.* does not bring forward the *tertium comparationis*, viz. that the soul is left in the lurch by the body, just as the charioteer by his horses, but introduces a new thought, viz. that the soul in its turn leaves the body in the lurch. — *cervicium messis* is translated wrongly by Kellner: "ein Bruch des Genicks"; the right interpretation was given by La Cerda: 'decollationem notat'. *Messis* has a strongly verbal sense, and is synonymous here to *desectio* (cf. e. g. *Sen. Agam.* 986/7: *impium ferro caput / demetere*). It stands to reason that we must not compare passages such as *apol.* 50, 13: *quotiens metimur a vobis* (for this metaphor, which is very a common one from *Hom. Il.* 11, 67/71 and 19, 221/3 downwards, see La Cerda's note on *Verg. Aen.* 10, 513: *proxima quaeque metit gladio*; we may add *Ephraim De morte* 5) or *Cic. paradox.* 6, 46: *illam Sullani temporis messem*. For the plural *cervices* (also *v. v.* 17), cf. *Thes. l. L. III:* 386, 46 *seqq.*; *Löfst., Synt.*, 1, 28; Landgraf's note on *Cic. pro Rosc. Amer.* 30 (p. 76/7); *Dahlmann*, 73; *Svenn., Pallad.*, 171₁. — *semel ac tantam*: for the juxtaposition of an adv. and an adj., cf. *Hofm., Synt.*, 468; Landgraf's note on *Cic. pro Rosc. Amer.* 123 (p. 229); *Carlsson*, 71 (*Plin. min.*); *Freund*, 35 (*Sueton.*); from *Tert. cf. adv. Marc.* 5, 7 (596, 22): *quaedam et breviter expungo*. — *ianuam*: perhaps this image was borrowed by *Tert.* from *Seneca, ep.* 70, 16: *scalpello aperitur ad illam magnam libertatem via*; *dial.* 1, 2, 10: *una manu latam libertati viam faciet* (sc. Cato) (*Anthol. Lat.* 398, 3/4: *qua spiritus ingens / exiret, magnum dextera* (sc. Catonis) *fecit iter*). Since, however, it is also frequently found in connection with martyrs (e. g. *Clem. Alex. strom.* 4, 7, 44, 1: τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ θανάτου πύλιν; *Euseb. hist. eccles.* 5, 1, 18: παντὸς τοῦ σώματος περιερωγότος καὶ ἡνεωγμένους; *Prud. perist.* 1, 29: *nobilis per vulnus amplum porta iustis panditur*), the possibility that *Tert.* became familiar with it from this side should also be taken into account. *Torq. Tasso, Gierus. liber.* 12, 62, 5/6: *e spatiosa porta / fa l'una e l'altra spada* is of course due to *Tasso's* reading of Latin poets. —

ruinae . . . elidens: Tert. may have in mind the view of the Stoics reported by Seneca (*ep.* 57, 7): (Stoici) *qui existimant animam hominis magno pondere extriti permanere non posse, et statim spargi, quia non fuerit illi exitus liber.* — *apoplexis*: this word occurs for the first time in the present passage and in *It. (cod. Monac.)* Deut. 28, 28 (LXX $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\zeta\acute{\iota}\alpha$, Vulg. *amentia*); *apoplexia* is found from Celsus downwards. — *diserueiat* has pregnant sense: “discessum crucians in momenta dirimit”; cf. e. g. 43, 5: *adulatur* = *adulans* *adjert.* — *prout* is the correct reading; *proubi* (AB), no instance of which is known (as the editors of the *Thes. l. L.* informed me), is due to the preceding *ubi.* — *haec facie*, i. e. *hac forma*; cf. e. g. *adv. Val.* 4 (182, 3): *varietate . . . innovata regularum facies* (cf. also 2, 3). — *partem* is wrongly interpreted by Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 3, 14) as an *accus. relationis*; the correct translation is: “the soul makes its extremity appear as a <n isolated > part”. The subst. *postremitas* is found from Tert. and Iren. lat. downwards (Cooper, 43). — *mediocritas*: the meaning ‘*media pars*’ is found in the present passage only, as I was informed by the editors of the *Thes. l. L.*; for the meaning ‘ $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ’ in the works of Cicero, cf. Wölfflin, *A. L. L.* 3, 459. Cf. Venant. Fort. 8, 3, 314 (*sic mediocre tenens cautius itur iter*), in which passage *iter mediocre* is synonymous to *iter medium*. — *summa* = *suprema*, which sense is rarely found from Verg. *Aen.* 2, 324 downwards. — *quia . . . ipsius est*: cf. the comm. on 10, 9 and 18, 13.

5. The belief that people on their death-bed may be able to see the future was widely-spread in antiquity from Hom. *Il.* 16, 851 *seqq.* and 22, 358 downwards. Cf. e. g. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1370 *seqq.*; Xen. *Cyrop.* 8, 7, 21; Plato *Apol.* 39 C; Arist. frag. 10 Rose (cf. Jaeger, *Arist.*, 166₂); Diodor. Sicul. 18, 1; Cic. *divin.* 1, 63; Plut. *defect. orac.* 40; Verg. *Aen.* 4, 614; 10, 739; Artemon in *schol. ad Iliad.* 16, 854; Plotin. 4, 3, 27; Olympiodor. in Plat. *Phaed.* p. 4, 17/9 and 48, 27/8 Norvin; Cypr. *de mortal.* 19 (309, 5/6 H.); Lactant. *div. instit.* 7, 12, 27 *seqq.*; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 27 (356 E). Cf. also Kroll’s note on Catull. 64, 188 *seq.* and for Posidonius, Reinhardt, *Pos.*, 439 and Heinemann, *Poseidonios’ metaphysische Schriften*, 2, 349/51. — *Hine . . . evenit* is to be read with Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 110), though Borleffs (*Museum* 41 (1934), 312) wants to retain *venit*. It is true that Tert. frequently uses *venire de* in the sense of *evenire de* (cf. Thierry, 156), but he never uses *venire* followed by an *accus. c. infin.* (this, however, occurs now and again after *evenire*: Plaut. *Cist.* 309; Hygin. *de munit. castr.* 40; Amm. Marc. 22, 9, 15; twice in Tert.’s works in quotations of scriptural passages: *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (579, 14 = Gal. 4, 4) and *ib.* 4, 34 = 533, 6; Deutn. 24, 1). For the use of *venire* = *evenire* in general, cf. Löfst., *Verm. Stud.*, 127₂; Nipperdey’s note on Tac. *Ann.* 14, 43; Schmalz, *B Ph W* 35 (1915), 1046; W. A. Baehrens, *Mnemos.* 38 (1910), 404 *seq.*; Wahlén, 43₁; Bendz, *Textkrit. und interpret. Bem. zu den frontischen Strategemata*, 22; Erikson, *Epiphan.*, 59; Salon., *Vit. Patr.*, 265; Friebel, 135. — *divortio*: cf. 7, 3. — *sollicitiore* = *intentioniore*, cf. e. g. Hegesipp. 3, 23, 1: *sollicito atque instructo agmine* and

Hagendahl, *Eran.* 22 (1924), 164₄; for the development of the sense of *sollicitudo*, which gradually has become synonymous with *cura*, *diligentia* (in Sap. 14, 17 and 19, 2 it is used as a translation of σπουδή), cf. Thielmann, *A. I. L.* 8, 249. — *ex maiore suggestu*: a most peculiar interpretation is given by La Cerda, viz. “quasi pro rostris et e maiore, id est, extremo et summo suggestu”; the meaning must be: “maiore ex parte molis suae”: for this sense of *suggestus*, cf. 1, 1. — *constituta* = καθεστῶσα, οὔσα, cf. 18, 4. — *superfluum*: ‘the rest’, as in 51, 4. This explanation is of course only possible when based on Tert.’s psychology; accordingly, it is found nowhere else. — *corpus istud*: ‘this (our) body’; for *iste* = *hic*, cf. 1, 1. — *Platonica . . . career*: σῶμα σῆμα, *Cratyl.* 400 C; *Gorg.* 493 A. This expression is very often quoted in popular philosophic writings (especially in Philo, e. g. *quod deus immut.* 150; *leg. alleg.* 1, 108; *de spec. leg.* 4, 188); from Tert.’s works cf. 35, 1 (Carpocrates) and *apol.* 17, 5. It is also very common in Christian literature, e. g. *Iren.* 1, 20, 2 (Carpocratians); *Clem. Alex. strom.* 3, 3, 16, 3; *Orig. de princ.* 1, 8, 4 (see Koetschau’s note); *Method. de resurr.* 1, 4, 2; 1, 5, 6; 1, 30, 4; *Arnob.* 2, 45; *Hieron. ep.* 51, 4, 4; *Prud. Hamart.* 918; *Cassiodor. de anim.* 2; for more passages, see Weyman, *Chr.-lat. Poesie*, 23. Originally this is a Pythagorean conception, cf. A. Delatte, *Étude sur la littér. Pythag.* (Paris 1915), 132; *Harder, Cic. Somn. Scip.*, 121; *Lortz*, 1, 236₄₁; *Wendland, Kultur*, 99; *Schmekel, Philos. d. mittl. Stoa*, 249. — *apostolica dei templum*: cf. 1 Cor. 3, 16 and 2 Cor. 6, 16, where, however, not the body, but the faithful are qualified as ναὸς θεοῦ (cf. *cult. fem.* 2, 1, 1). For the use made of this image by Ignatius, Tatianus, and the *Acta Thomae*, cf. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen*, 143. — *cum in Christo est*, viz. after and through baptism (1 Cor. 3, 16; 2 Cor. 6, 16); this subject is often discussed by Tert. in *de pudic.*; cf. d’Alès, *Théol.*, 485/7. — *consepto*: this word occurs in a similar context in *Chalcid. transl.* 30 D: (animas) *intra conseptum et limitem suum continens*; 36 E; *comm.* 224. *infaecat* is ἀ. λ. — *corneum specular*: this image seems to derive from a Platonic source; cf. 46, 2. Of course *sed* only contrasts the parenthesis *ceterum . . . Christo est*, so this should not be bracketed.

6. The discussion on the continuity of the soul, which not even death does destroy (§ 4), having led Tert. to a description of prophesying at the moment of dying (§ 5), he concludes with an exposition of the liberation of the soul by death; this conclusion is only loosely connected with the main theme of this chapter and may be regarded as an epilogue to the discussion of death in ch. 50—53. — *colatur* = *purgatur*, cf. 48, 1. — *oppanso*: cf. the note on 41, 4: *aulaeo*. — *meram . . . suam*: similarly, *v. v.* 15: *vera et tota et pura virginitas*. The whole paragraph shows a strong resemblance to the discussion found in 41, 4: at death the soul disengages itself from the body, just as at baptism from the evil adhering to it; in both cases it attains to ‘the light’ and recognizes its own essence which has now been purified of all *accidentia* (*semetipsam . . . recognoscit, respiscit*; 41, 4: *totam lucem*

suam conspicit; cf. in particular 41, 2). Hence it is not surprising that other passages from Tert.'s writings in which he discusses the *testimonium animae* furnish parallels for this paragraph, particularly *apol.* 17, 5: *cum tamen resipiscit* (sc. anima), *ut ex crapula, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, et sanitatem suam patitur*. Similar expositions are common in Christian literature; cf. for instance Aug. *gen. ad litt.* 10, 14, 24: *cum vero paulatim ab huius oblivionis torpore anima resipiscens possit converti ad deum suum . . . quid ei obest illo velut somno paululum immergi, unde paulatim evigilans in lucem intelligentiae . . . potest . . . eligere vitam bonam?* Cf. also Max. Tyr. 9, 6. — *de somnio* is the correct reading (though in *apol.* 17, 5 Tert. writes *ut ex somno*), as is proved by the use of *imagines* (cf. 45, 4: *cum in nullo permoveremur, a vacuis scilicet imaginibus, si compotes somniaremus*). — *emergens*: this verb is often used in this context, e. g. *paen.* 3, 2: *domino enim cognito ultro spiritus a suo auctore respectus emergit ad notitiam veritatis*; *adv. Marc.* 3, 20 (410, 14); *Pont. Vit. Cypr.* 2, 3; *Cypr. ad Demetr.* 25 (369, 25); *Min. Fel.* 1, 4. The conception underlying it is the *emersio de lavacro baptismi* (cf. e. g. *pud.* 6 (230, 9/10): *exinde caro quaecumque in Christo reliquas sordes pristinas solvit, alia iam res est, nova emergit*; *bapt.* 8, 4). — *devorsorii*: cf. 7, 4. — *angeli*: viz. the angel who leads the soul to its abode in the other world. The original conception seems to have been that only the souls of the just are conducted by angels (e. g. the soul of Lazarus according to *Luc.* 16, 22; for Judaism, cf. Strack-Billerbeck, 2, 223 *seqq.*; for more materials, cf. Cumont, *Afterlife*, 163; *Relig. Orient.*⁴, 264/5; *Les vents et les anges psychopompes*, in: *Pisciculi . . . Fr. J. Dölger dargeboten* (Münster i. W. 1939), 74/5; Hopfer, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 78 (§ 317); G. Stulfauth, *Die Engel in der altchristl. Kunst* (1897), 37 *seqq.*). It is only in the fourth century that such an escort is also mentioned for evil souls, e. g. Chrysost. *hom. in Matth.* 53 (54) *ex.* (P. G. 57/58, 532): τῆς ψυχῆς . . . τὴν ὄψιν τῶν ἐρχομένων ἀγγέλων οὐ φερούσης; *ib.*: ἀγγέλους ἀπειληφόρους; *Prud. Hamart.* 943/51 and 958/9. — *de . . . facie*: cf. Chrysost., *loc. cit.* (ὄψιν); *hist. Josephi fabri lignarii* 13 (*Evang. apocr.*, ed. Tischendorf, p. 121): *Neque facies angeli mihi ad custodiam inde a formationis meae die designati aversa sit a me; verum praebeat se mihi itineris socium, usque dum me ad te perduxerit: sit vultus eius mihi amoenus et hilaris, et comitetur me in pace*; *Narratio Zosimi* 13 (James, *Apocr. Anecd.*, 1, p. 104/5): οὔτε γὰρ ὀχλεῖται ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ ἐξελθεῖν· χαίρουσιν γὰρ οἱ ἄγγελοι ὅταν παραλαμβάνωσιν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς . . . καὶ ἰδόντες τὴν ψυχὴν ἄσπιλον ἐξερχομένην χαίρουσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι. It is evident that Tert. has not such demons in mind here as were thought to lie in wait for the soul at the moment of death (cf. Archambault's note on Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 105, 3: τὸν θεόν, τὸν δυνάμενον ἀποστρέφαι πάντα ἀναιδῆ πονηρὸν ἄγγελον μὴ λαβέσθαι ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς; Peterson, *Eis Θεός*, 40/1), but is indeed thinking of angels as a *potestas divinae voluntatis ministra* (37, 1), who conduct both just and evil souls. The fact that he compares these angels to the *Mercurius poetarum* (cf. also Kroll, *Herm. Trismeg.*, 270₂), who was undoubtedly looked upon as a demon by him, is of no consequence,

for this comparison has a strictly literary character (see the next note). — *evocatoris* is the correct reading; we find a reminiscence here of Verg. *Aen.* 4, 242: *animas ille* (sc. Mercurius) *evocat Orco* (perhaps Tert. wrongly supposes that in this verse *Orco* means *ad Orcum*; for other 'hidden' quotations from Vergil, cf. the notes on 43, 7; 49, 2; 50, 4). *evocator*, a very rare word, usually has a different meaning (Cic. *Catil.* 1, 27: 'agitator, seditionist'; [Rufin.] in *Amos* 7, 1/3 = *is qui bestias accitu movet*). The usual sense of *evocare animas*, viz. *ab inferis*, occurs in 57, 2; for this passage, cf. Sen. *ep.* 61, 2: *tamquam me . . . mors evocatura sit*; *Epitaph. Sen.* (*Anthol. Lat.* 667), 3: *me procul a vobis deus evocat* (cf. Löfst., *Eran.* 8 (1908), 115/6); Tert. *pat.* 9 (15, 3/5): *et Christum laedimus, cum evocatos quosque ab illo quasi miserandos non aequanimiter accipimus*; Thes. l. L. V, 2: 1056, 72 seqq.

54—55). *The abode of the souls after death.* — I. (54). *Some philosophic views.*

"All philosophers who contend that the soul is immortal or at all events continues to exist for a certain time after death, such as the Stoics, do grant a residence in the higher regions to the souls of the wise only (§ 1). Plato assigns them an abode in the ether (but only if they have adorned their lives by sodomy), Arius in the air, and the Stoics under the moon (§ 2). As to the last-mentioned philosophers, it is rather surprising that they relegate the souls of those who do not belong to the wise to such regions of the air as are nearest to the earth, whereas on the other hand they suppose that they are instructed by the souls of the wise; for how is this instruction possible, if they are so far apart? (§ 3). The other souls are sent by them to hell, which has been described by Plato in the *Phaedo* as the 'womb of the earth', where all earthly filth flows together (§ 4)".

The doxographical material worked up in this chapter partly comes from the *Vetusta Placita* (§ 1, cf. in the comm. the parallel passages from Aëtius), partly from the Ἐπιτομή of Arius Didymus (§ 2; cf. the comm. and Introduction, pp. 38*/9*). With Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, 205/6 and Karpp, 41, it may be supposed that these materials, too, have been transmitted to Tert. by Soranus, who probably also discussed eschatology, as he "took up arms against all the views of the philosophers" (6, 6), though he himself regarded the soul as mortal. The main object of Tert. in this chapter is to create an antithesis to ch. 55: whereas, according to the Christian doctrine, even Christ descended into hell, pagan philosophers consider the souls of the wise as beyond this necessity; in this respect they resemble those Christians *qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas* (55, 2; the connection is particularly clear in 55, 4: *Sed in aethere dormitio nostra cum puerariis Platonis aut in aere cum Ario aut circa lunam cum Endymionibus Stoicorum? Immo, inquis, in paradiso*). As Tert. is only interested in this argumentation (the nucleus of the chapter is to be found in the words *philosophi . . . suas solas, id est sapientium,*

animas in supernis mansionibus collocant . . . reliquas animas ad inferos deiciunt), and adapts all facts to it, he is exceedingly unexact in the working up of his materials; this added to the defectiveness of our knowledge of Stoic eschatology (particularly with regard to the differences between the doctrines of the ancient and of the younger Stoics) makes it practically impossible to attain to definite statements about the data which Tert. found in his sources. For the quotation from the *Phaedo*, cf. Introduction, p. 41*.

1. **Quo . . . deducetur**: ind. as in 53, 1: *quo . . . anima . . . devertit*; the two sentences are almost identical. For this habit of Tert. of 'bridging' expatiations, cf. the note on 25, 1. *iam hinc*: viz. after the digression (53, 2: *interstruam*) in 53, 2/6. — **qualiterqualiter**: this conjecture of Oehler is necessary: the reading of A B (*qualiter*) cannot receive any support from those passages where *unde* and *ubi* instead of *undeunde* and *ubiubi* are found in the MSS of Tert., as in all these places the *lectio tradita* is wrong (cf. the note on 51, 8); to defend the conjecture we may compare *res. 2* (28, 8/9): *omnes . . . fere haereticī eam* (sc. animae salutem), *quoquomodo volunt, tamen non negant* (*quoquomodo* cod. Montepess. and Kroym., *quomodo* cod. Paternac. and Rhen.). It is true that in writings belonging to the last period *qualiter* = *qualiterqualiter* is sometimes found (e. g. Anthimus p. 10, 1/2 Rose: *agnellinae vero carnes aut de haedis optimae sunt, qualiter volueris, aut vaporatas aut elixas in iuscello*), but *qualiterqualiter* is very common too in imperial Latin, especially in juridical literature (e. g. *dig. 4, 4, 7 pr.*; 26, 7, 5, 10; 43, 16, 3, 17); cf. Rönsch, *It.*², 231. The meaning is of course that Pythagoras, Empedocles, and Plato did not uphold the immortality of the soul in the right way, as they propagated the doctrine of metempsychosis; cf. the next note. — **Pythagoras . . . Plato**: in his source Tert. can only have found that, according to these philosophers, the soul is immortal (e. g. Aët. 4, 7, 1: καὶ Πυθαγόρας . . . καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς . . . ἀφθαρτον εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεφάναντο; cf. *D D G* 205, and especially *res. 1* = 25, 16/7); that Pythagoras and Empedocles assigned *supernae mansiones* to the souls of the wise is mentioned nowhere in doxographical literature, and in the following paragraph Tert. has forgotten them completely and only takes Plato's view into account. He has only mentioned them here, because he was familiar with this combination on account of his refutation of metempsychosis in ch. 28/33. We have noted already (46, 5) that Tert. is often inexact in matters which are of no use for his own purposes. — **conflagratio** (also *adv. Marc. 3, 24* = 420, 10) is the common translation of ἐκπύρωσις from Sen. *nat. qu. 3, 28, 7* downwards. — **ut Stoici**: this is certainly due to a doxographical note such as Aët. 4, 7, 3 (the two passages have already been compared by Diels, *Dox. Gr., ad loc.*): οἱ δὲ Στωικοὶ τὰς χωριζομένας τῶν σωμάτων ψυχὰς διαρκεῖν μὲν καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰς ζῆν ἔφασαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν ἀσθνεστέραν ἐπ' ὀλίγον, τὴν δέ γε ἰσχυροτέραν μέχρι τῆς τοῦ παντὸς ἐκπύρωσεως (Theodoret. 5, 23; [Plut.] *epit. 4, 7, 3* after ἀσθνεστέραν adds: ταύτην δὲ εἶναι τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν, after ἰσχυροτέραν: οἷα ἐστὶ περὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς); cf. *St.*

V. F. 1, 522; 2, 809/14; 817; 821/2; *D D G* 471, 18/21. Again Tert. is inaccurate, as according to the Stoics (with the exception of Cleanthes, *St. V. F.* 1, 522), only the souls of the wise continue to exist till the ἐκπύρωσις; but this privilege does not interest him here and is consequently omitted. — *mansionibus* = *deversoriis* (§ 3 in *tanta distantia deversorium*; cf. the note on 7, 4); this concrete sense occurs from Plin. mai. and Suet. downwards. For this view of the Stoics, cf. the comm. on § 2.

2. *amore puerorum* is a malicious allusion to Pl. *Phaedrus* 249 A: παιδεραστήσαντος μετὰ φιλοσοφίας. For more about this subject, cf. the note on 1, 6: *nec adulescentiam vitians*. — *in aetherem*: Plato *loc. cit.*: αἱ δ' εἰς τοῦρανοῦ τινα τόπον ὑπὸ τῆς Δίχης κουφισθεῖσαι διάγουσιν ἀξίως οὗ ἐν ἀνθρώπου εἶδει ἐβίωσαν βίου. — *sublimantur* (an archaism: Enn. *scen.* 280, Cato, Vitruv., Apul.; cf. Cooper, 230) may be due to κουφισθεῖσαι in the passage from Plato (κουφοφοροῦσιν Sext. Emp. *adv. math.* 9, 71, cf. the note on *apud Stoicos sub lunam*); it is quite possible that Tert. has consulted the original text (for this question see Introduction, p. 44*, n. 6.). — *apud Arium in aerem*: Arius records the dwelling of the souls in the air as a Stoic view (*Epitome frag. phys.* 39 = Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 15, 20, 4, *D D G* 471, 11/4): Εἶναι δὲ ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ ὄλῳ φασίν, ὃ καλοῦσιν αἰθέρα καὶ αέρα κύκλῳ περὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἀναθυμιάσεις· τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς ψυχὰς προσπεφυκέναι ταύτῃ, ὅσαι τε ἐν ζῳοῖς εἰσὶ καὶ ὅσαι ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι (for this word, cf. the note on 9, 5)· διαμένειν γὰρ ἕκεῖ τὰς τῶν ἀποθανόντων ψυχὰς. Though it is quite probable that Arius, who was a Stoic in the first place (cf. e. g. Witt, *Albinus*, 75), subscribed to this δόγμα, we must certainly reckon with the possibility that Tert. (or Soranus in this case? see Introduction, p. 34*) is inaccurate for the third time and represents a sentence copied by Arius as containing the opinion of Arius himself. At all events, he is wrong in referring this notice to the *animae sapientes*, Arius mentioning τὰς τῶν ἀποθανόντων ψυχὰς. — *apud Stoicos sub lunam*: as has been pointed out already in the preface to this chapter, we know too little about the eschatology of the Stoics to estimate the value of this information. It seems probable that it refers to the view of Posidonius which was copied by Cicero *Tusc.* 1, 42/3 (cf. P. Corssen, *De Posidonio Rhodio M. Tullii Ciceronis in libro I. Tusc. disp. et in Somn. Scip. auctore* (Bonn 1878), 45 seq.): *necesse est ferantur ad caelum* (sc. animae) *et ab iis perrumpatur et dividatur crassus hic et concretus aer qui est terrae proximus... in quo nubes imbres ventique coguntur...; quam regionem cum superavit animus naturamque sui similem contigit et agnovit, iunctis ex anima tenui et ex ardore solis temperato ignibus insistit* (the last words refer to the sphere of the moon, cf. Diels, *Rh. Mus.*, N. F. 34 (1879), 488 seq.) and Sext. Empir. *adv. math.* 9, 71 (= *St. V. F.* 2, 812): λεπτομερεῖς... οὐσαι (sc. αἱ ψυχαί) καὶ οὐχ ἥττον πυρώδεις ἢ πνευματώδεις εἰς τοὺς ἄνω μᾶλλον τρόπους κουφοφοροῦσιν... ἔκσκηνοι γοῦν ἡλίου γενόμεναι τὸν ὑπὸ σεληνήνῃν οἰκοῦσι τόπον, ἐνθάδε

τε διὰ τὴν εἰλικρίνειαν τοῦ ἀέρος πλείονα πρὸς διαμονὴν λαμβάνουσι χρόνον, τροφῇ τε χρῶνται οἰκείᾳ τῇ ἀπὸ γῆς ἀναθυμίασει ὥς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἄστρα, τὸ διαλυθὲν τε αὐτὰς ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς τόποις οὐκ ἔχουσιν. As it does not follow from these passages that the region of the moon was regarded as the residence of the souls of the σπουδαῖοι only, it is not impossible that Tert. commits the same error here as in the case of Arius. On the other hand, Plutarch in the myth inserted in *De facie in orbe lunae* (28, 943 C/945 D), which may also be derived from Posidonius, named the moon as the abode of pious souls; the same conception occurs in a fragment of Porphyrius (Stob. *ecl.* 1, 14, 61): αἰνιττόμενος (viz. Homer) ὅτι ταῖς τῶν εὐσεβῶς βεβιωκότων ψυχαῖς μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν οἰκεῖός ἐστι τόπος ὁ περὶ τὴν σελήνην (for all these passages, cf. Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI, 24/6). We may also refer to Lact. *div. inst.* 7, 20 (= *St. V. F.* 2, 813; Arnim *ad loc.*: “Stoica in sequentibus cum Platonice commixta sunt. Posidonium haec sapiunt”) who says that, according to the Stoics, the just and the impious souls have different residences in the beyond (the moon is not mentioned), and to Cornutus *de nat. deor.* 5 (p. 4 Lang): ὁ ἄδης ἐστὶν ὁ παχυμέρεστάτος καὶ προσγειότατος ἄηρ (Tert. § 3: *quod imprudentes animas circa terram prosternant*). From this we may perhaps conclude that Tert. here renders the view of Posidonius correctly (we are not able to say if this also was the view of the ancient Stoics, though Lact. *div. instit.*, *loc. cit.* (= *St. V. F.* 1, 147) seems to point that way: *Esse inferos Zenon Stoicus docuit et sedes piorum ab impiis esse discretas: et illos quidem quietus et delectabiles incolere regiones, hos vero luere poenas in tenebrosis locis atque in caeni voraginibus horrendis*; Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 319₄: “Nur diesen, von den oberen Regionen geschiedenen ἄηρ = ἄδης kann Zeno gemeint haben, wenn er von *loca tenebrosa* redete, in denen die Seelen der Unweisen ihre Unweisheit zu büßen hätten (von Lactant. *Instit.* 7, 7, 13 platonisierend umgedeutet)”; cf. *ib.*, 320₁. Unfortunately, we do not know if Cornutus renders the opinion of the Stoics in general, of ancient Stoics, or of Posidonius).

3. *circa terram*: cf. the preceding note. — *illas . . . erudiri*: the instruction of souls in the beyond was a special doctrine of the younger Stoics. The most important passages referring to it are Cic. *Somn. Scip.* 3, 6 *seqq.* and Sen. *Consol. ad Marc.* 25, 2; they have been discussed together with the present passage by Badstübner, *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik der philosophischen Schriften Senecas* (Hamburg 1901), who is probably right in supposing that this instruction was a doctrine of Posidonius. On the other hand, he is certainly wrong in contending (p. 3) that, according to Tert., this instruction takes place “in the time when the souls of the wise still linger in the lower regions”, and that probably Tert. has committed an error; here he draws a conclusion which has not been drawn by Tert. himself, who only says that, according to the Stoics, the *imprudentes animae* are staying *circa terram* and are instructed by the *animae sapientes*, and, instead of trying to find a connection between these two notes, only

points out their incompatibility. Another error of Tert. is to be mentioned: from the passages just quoted we see with absolute certainty that, according to the younger Stoics, this instruction was not meant for the *imprudentes animae*, the φαῦλοι, but for σπουδαῖοι, who were thus taught about things unattainable to them during their life on earth. By this misrepresentation of the facts Tert. could add a new element to his refutation of the Stoic δόγμα, viz. the *distantia deversoriorum*. Afterwards this instruction in the beyond became a dogma of Origenes (for which cf. Atzberger, *Eschatol.*, 395), e. g. *de princ.* 1, 6, 3: *ut in primis alii, alii in secundis, nonnulli etiam in ultimis temporibus et per maiora ac graviora supplicia nec non et diuturna ac multis, ut ita dicam, saeculis tolerata asperioribus emendationibus reparati et restituti eruditionibus primo angelicis tum deinde etiam superiorum graduum virtutibus, ut sic per singula ad superiora propecti usque ad ea quae sunt invisibilia et aeterna perveniant*; *ib.* 2, 11, 7; *homil. in Luc.* 24 (V, p. 179 Lomm.). This form of instruction is to be distinguished from the παιδευσίς προσήκουσα after death mentioned as a Stoic δόγμα by [Galen] *hist. philos.* 24 (*D D G* 614, 10 seqq.), since it is there supposed that the Stoics adhered to the doctrine of metempsychosis (which, according to Badstübner, 7₄, is possible, whereas Zeller, 3, 1: 157₂ and Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 324, hold the opposite view; cf. W. Stettner, *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* (Stuttgart-Berlin 1934), 66). — *deversoriorum*: cf. 7, 4. — *discipulae*: the feminine form, which is extremely rare, also occurs in *test. anim.* 5 (140, 20/1). — *convertabunt* (B) is the *lectio difficilior* (*convertentur* A Bmg) and must be retained (the only other instance occurs in Solin. 27, 7: -asse, where M. reads *convenisse*); *concessare*, *mon.* 7 is equally rare (cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 95). — *postumae*: cf. 17, 12. — *usus ac fructus*: a law term (*Thes. l. L. VI*: 1375, 60 seqq.; also *cult. fem.* 2, 3, 1; cf. *res.* 7 (36, 7/8): *quem . . . naturae usum, quem mundi fructum*).

4. *Reliquas . . . deiciunt*: at first sight one may be inclined to connect these words with the immediately preceding sentences, and to regard *Stoici* as the subject of *deiciunt*; this is done by Rohde (*Psyche*, 2, 319₄), who supposes that *ad inferos* corresponds with *circa terram* in § 3. But this interpretation must be wrong, the *imprudentes animae* having been mentioned continually in § 3, so that we cannot explain why they are here described as *reliquas animas*, if *Stoici* is the subject indeed; in this case we should expect that in the preceding sentence the *animae sapientes*, not the *animae imprudentes* should have been mentioned. Hence it is necessary to regard § 3 as a digression (which for the sake of clearness might be put in parentheses) and to connect this sentence with the end of § 2: *Itaque apud illum in aethere sublimantur animae sapientes, apud Arium in aere, apud Stoicos sub lunam . . . Reliquas animas ad inferos deiciunt* (it is less probable that we should connect it with the end of § 1: *omnes ferme philosophi, etc., suas solas, id est sapientium, animas in supernis mansionibus collocant . . . Reliquas animas ad inferos deiciunt*, firstly, because the digression comprises § 3 only, secondly, because the view of Arius concerns

Tert. much more than those of Pythagoras and Empedocles; cf. the note on § 1). So we must regard *Plato, Arius et Stoici* as the subject of *deiciunt*. The correctness of this interpretation is proved by the fact that in the following sentence *Plato's* description of hell is mentioned. The Stoic view about the situation of the ἄδης in the προσγειότατος ἄηρ (for which cf. the comm. on § 2) is not mentioned here, because Tert. needs an antithesis to the Christian conception of hell and the passage from the *Phaedo* is more suited for this purpose. — in *Phaedone*: Tert. combines various parts of this description, firstly the main passage 111 E/112 A: ἐν τι τῶν χασμάτων τῆς γῆς ἄλλως τε μέγιστον τυγχάνει ὃν καὶ διαμπερὲς τετρημένον δι' ὅλης τῆς γῆς, τοῦτο ὅπερ "Ομηρος εἶπε λέγων αὐτὸ τῆλε μάλ', ἦχι βάδιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον' ὃ καὶ ἄλλοθι καὶ ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν ποιητῶν Τάρταρον κεκλήκασιν. εἰς γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ χάσμα συρρέουσι τε πάντες οἱ ποταμοί, etc., secondly some reminiscences of other parts, viz., 109 B: ἡμᾶς οἰκεῖν . . . ὥσπερ περὶ τέλμα μύρμηκας and *ib.* εἶναι γὰρ πανταχῇ περὶ(!) τὴν γῆν πολλὰ κοῖλα . . . (*cauositas* 55, 1) εἰς ἃ ξυνερρυηκέναι τό τε ὕδωρ καὶ τὴν ὀμίχλην καὶ τὸν ἄέρα, and especially 109 C: οὐ (sc. τοῦ αἰθέρος) δὴ ὑποστὰς μεν (*sentina* 55, 1) ταῦτα (sc. τὸ ὕδωρ, etc.) καὶ ξυρρεῖν αἰεὶ εἰς τὰ κοῖλα τῆς γῆς (Tert. overlooks the fact that in this passage *Plato* does not at all speak about hell). — *labes mundialium sordium*: a notable instance of the *genit. inhaerentiae* (just as *caeno immunditiarum*), which occurs much less frequently in Tert.'s writings than in those of *Cypr.* (for whom cf. *Schrijn.-Mohrm.*, *Cypr.*, 1, 81/5); four other instances are mentioned by *Hoppe*, *Synt.*, 19. For this *genit.*, cf. *Hofm.*, *Synt.*, 395; *Bernhard*, *Apul.*, 173/4; *Friebel*, 146/7; *Linderebauer*, 186; *Bonnet*, 715, and the literature mentioned by *Schrijn.-Mohrm.*, *loc. cit.*, 83. — *mundialium*: a 'Christianism', which occurs for the first time in Tert.'s works. Here it denotes the *sordes* of the atmosphere (not of the earth, cf. *Phaedo* 109 C); in the same way, *elementa mundialia* is used in *spect.* 9 (11, 20) and *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (580, 15/6) (cf. also *ad nat.* 2, 4, 10; 2, 5, 17; *adv. Prax.* 12 = 246, 9). Mostly it refers to 'the (evil, pagan) world' and is a synonym of *saecularis*, e.g. *adv. Marc.* 4, 26 (509, 20): *mundialis spiritus* (as opposed to *sp. sanctus*); *iei.* 13 (292, 6); *res.* 47 (95, 18). The *i* in *mundialis* is due to analogy (*nuptialis*, etc.; *Lavarenne*, 412₁); cf. *Rönsch*, *It.*², 120; *Goelz.*, *Jér.*, 145; *Fassbender*, 67. — *quo . . . ibi . . . illie*: cf. 12, 3. — *exhalent*: 'emanate, evaporate'; the intransitive meaning is found from *Stat. Theb.* 10, 108 downwards; cf. *Thes. l. l.* V, 2: 1405, 35/47 and the note on 55, 3. — *caeno immunditiarum suarum*: especially in this context the *genit. inhaerentiae* is often found, e.g. *Apul.* 6: *tetra labes sordium* and *met.* 1, 7: *sordium enormem eluviem*; *Salvian. de gub. dei* 7, 20: *caenum imprudicarum sordium*; cf. also *Arnob.* 5, 22: *locus . . . in quem spurcitiae se omnes sentinarum conluvionibus derivarent*. — *grossiorem* (A B) may be regarded as the *lectio difficilior* and hence be retained; *grossus* occurs from *Colum.* downwards and is a rather vulgar word, which may explain its choice in the present passage (*labes . . . sordium, caeno*

immunditiarum). However, we often find *aer crassus* (from Cic. downwards; cf. Thes. l. L. I: 1050, 21/4; also Arator 2, 1463; Amm. Marc. 20, 3, 5: *crassato aere*; cf. Avien. *carm.* 4, 233: *coactus aer atque crassior dies*). — Instead of *haustum* Krohn (Thes. l. L. VI, 2: 2337, 3) proposes to read *haustu*; this is quite unnecessary, for *haustus* often has the sense of 'aqua haurienda, aqua quae hauritur' or 'aer hauriendus'. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 22, 5: *si . . . aer pestilentes haustus suos obfundit* (Waltz., *comm.*, 163: 'ses vapeurs, ses miasmes'); moreover, cf. Verg. *ge.* 4, 220/1: *haustus aetherios* ('divinos spiritus' Serv.); Sen. *Oed.* 1056: *vividus haustus* (= auras vitales) and *nat. qu.* 2, 53, 2; Thes. l. L. VI, 3: 2576, 30/4. — *privatum*: 'particular', 'special' (cf. the use of *privat* in 2, 2). *privatum . . . aerem stipent*, i. e. "proprium quoddam aeris genus et quidem densissimum efficiunt"; a similar *prolepsis* occurs in *inscript. Christ. Leblant*, 1, p. 219, 16: *cum . . . densaret gelidas horrida bruma nives*. This may refer to the *δμίχλη* mentioned in *Phaedo* 109 B, but it seems more probable that, for the last time in this chapter, Tert. is inaccurate and confuses the views of Plato and the Stoics (*grossiorem haustum* ∞ Cic. *crassus hic et concretus aer*; Cornutus *ὁ παχυμερέστατος . . . ἄήρ*).

55. The Christian view about hell.

"According to us Christians, hell is not an 'open cavern' as described by Plato, but a waste space in the interior of the earth; the proof for this is furnished by Holy Scripture, which tells us that Christ stayed three days 'in the heart of the earth' (§ 1). For Christ conformed to the requirements of His human nature by descending into hell for the purpose of informing the patriarchs and prophets that He had appeared. This suffices to show that hell is a subterranean region indeed, and to confute such proud Christians as presume that the souls of the faithful are above the necessity of entering hell (§ 2). "But Christ's descent", it is said, "has released us from this necessity". This view is confuted by Holy Scripture: only when Christ will descend for the second time, heaven will be opened to us (§ 3). And where are we to suppose the souls of the Christians to stay in the meantime? Surely not in the ether, in the air, or under the moon, as was presumed by pagan philosophers? "Certainly not", so my opponents say, "but in paradise; for thither patriarchs and prophets have moved too, as they participated in the resurrection of the Lord". If this is true, how are we to explain that St. John and Perpetua in their visions of paradise only saw martyrs there? This suffices to prove that paradise is opened to such only as <by martyrdom> have died in Christ (§ 4). For it is only martyrdom which is rewarded by a special residence after death: the blood shed for the true faith is the key to paradise (more about this subject may be found in my treatise 'On Paradise') (§ 5)".

As we have observed already in the preface to ch. 7, Tert., not in the last place on account of his polemics against Marcion, is an ardent defender of the opinion that until the last judgment all souls remain in *carcere seu deversorio inferum* (7, 4; this was the common view in

the second and third centuries: Justin, Clem. Alex., Novatian., probably also Irenaeus; cf. C. Clemen, "*Niedergefahren zu den Toten*" (Giessen 1900), 146/51; K. Gschwind, *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt* (Neutestam. Abhandl. II, 3/5, Münster i. W. 1911), 155₂). He makes an exception for the souls of martyrs only, which immediately after death are admitted to paradise; cf. e. g. *res.* 43 (89, 6/8): *nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes dominum, nisi ex martyrii praerogativa, paradiso scilicet, non inferis deversurus* (however, before becoming acquainted with Marcion, he held a different view, as is shown by *apol.* 47, 13: *si paradisum nominemus, locum divinae amoenitatis recipiendis sanctorum spiritibus destinatum, maceria quadam igneae illius zonae a notitia orbis communis segregatum*). Paradise is regarded by him as situated in heaven (*apol.*, *loc. cit.*; by the *igneae zona* he understands the ether, Waltz., *Ét.*, 377): this is proved by § 4 *paradisi regio . . . quae subicitur allari* (see the note) and his statement in *ad mart.* 3 that the martyr has his *politia in caelis* (F. Loofs, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 4, 661 asserts that Tert. regards paradise as identical with the *sinus Abrahae* and that after Christ's descent into hell patriarchs and prophets are thought to have moved there as *appendices dominicae resurrectionis* (§ 4); he overlooks the fact that this is mentioned in a sentence which does not contain the view of Tert. himself; the same error (which is corrected by C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern* (T U 43 (1919), 515₃) is made by Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, 2, 903). We may also refer to the antithesis *paradiso . . . non inferis* in *res.* 43.

This conception of a privileged position of martyrs (which, as regards Tert., is also due to the high esteem in which martyrdom was held by the Montanists: Bonwetsch, *Montan.*, 105/8; Kattenbusch, *Z N T W* 4 (1903), 116₁; Labriolle, *Crise Mont.*, *passim*) already occurs in the later period of Judaism (e. g. *Henoch* 47, 1; 108, 7 *seqq.*; *Esra* 7, 89; *Jubil.* 23, 30 *seq.*; 4 *Maccab.* 16, 25; 17, 18; 18, 23; *Flav. Joseph. bell. Judaic.* 1, 650 *seqq.*; see Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, 2^a, 642) and early Christianity (*Act. apost.* 7, 56: the *protomartyr* Stephanus exclaims: ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανούς διγνοιγμένους; *Apoc.* 2, 7, 10; 3, 5. 12. 21, etc.; for more passages, see Kattenbusch, *loc. cit.*, 117₁ and *Das apostolische Symbol*, 2, 901/3; Schmidt, *loc. cit.*, 477 (Ignatius); Dibelius' note on Philipp. 1, 26 (*Hdb. N. T.* 11, p. 69); H. von Camperhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, 125₈; Achelis, *Christ.*, 2, 439/41; Achelis and Flemming in their edition of the Syrian *Didascalia* = T. U. 25 (1903/4), 317). In this connection the loss of Tert.'s book on paradise is much to be regretted.

It is from these premisses that we are to understand Tert.'s view about Christ's descent into hell. He appeals to Eph. 4, 9: τὸ δὲ 'ἀνέβη' τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς, where he refers the words τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς to hell, just like Irenaeus and most of the Occidentals, e. g. Hieron., Mar. Victorin., and the Ambrosiaster (cf. Gschwind, 168/9). For Tert. the conception (which is also due to Matth. 27, 52/3) that on this occasion Christ freed

from hell either all those who were captives there or only the *justi, patriarchae et prophetae* is of course altogether out of the question (for this conception, cf. W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutest. Apokr.* (Tübingen 1909), 249 and his note on Ignat. *ad Magn.* 9, 3 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 227); W. Bousset, *Hauptprobl.*, 255; *Kyrios Christos*, 32/40; *Zur Hadesfahrt Christi*, *Z N T W* 19 (1919/20), 50/66; F. Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte*, 145 and art. 'Descent to Hades', *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* 4, 654/63; F. Diekamp, *Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des heiligen Thomas*, 23¹⁵ (Münster i. W. 1921), 309/11; Schlier, 72/6; Windisch's note on I Petr. 3, 20 (*Hdb. N. T.* 15, p. 71/2); Gschwind, *passim*; Schmidt, *Exkurs II*, p. 453/576); he assumes that Christ only made the patriarchs and prophets *compotes sui*, "acquainted with Himself (viz., with the fact of His appearance)"; he restricts himself to the statement that Christ preached to the just, the patriarchs, and the prophets. This also is the opinion of Justin (Schmidt, 490/1) and of the author of [Hippolyt.] *Περὶ τοῦ παντός* (*ib.* 511/2), whereas Hippolytus (*ib.*, 508/9) and Irenaeus (*ib.*, 494/5) share the common view that Christ's descent delivered the just, etc. from hell.

With regard to this sermon in hell (which seems to be mentioned for the first time in I Petr. 3, 19 (ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πρεσβυτεῖς ἐκήρυξεν), Ev. Petri 10, 41 *seq.*, and *Orac. Sibyll.* 1, 377 *seq.*; 8, 293. 310 *seq.*; see Bauer, *Leben Jesu*, 247/9; according to Schmidt, 474, Christ's descent is not mentioned before Ignat. *ad Magn.* 9, 3), Justin and Irenaeus refer to an apocryphical text attributed to Jeremiah, which was almost certainly composed by a Christian (cf. Schmidt, 467/72; Archambault's note on Justin *dial.* 72, 4). Justin quotes it in this form: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἱερεμίου ὁμοίως ταῦτα περιέκοψαν· Ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἅγιος Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χρώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐγγελίσασθαι· αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, Iren. 3, 22, 1: *Esaias ait* (wrongly used instead of *Hieremias*, because the preceding quotation was introduced by *Esaias ait*, as was already observed by Feuard): *Et commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum qui dormierant in terra sepultionis: et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quae est ab eo, ut salvaret eos*; with the name of Jeremiah 4, 36, 1 and *praed. evang.* 78 (p. 42 Karapet), without a name 4, 50 and 5, 31, 1. Besides Irenaeus (for whom see Bauer, 248) and Justin we may mention the *presbyter* quoted by Iren. 4, 42, 4 (cf. Schmidt, 478/81): *Et propter hoc Dominum in ea quae sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelisantem et illis adventum suum, remissione peccatorum existente his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui sperabant in eum, id est, qui adventum eius praenuntiaverunt, et dispositionibus eius servierunt, iusti et prophetae et patriarchae*, and the Syrian *Didascalia* 26 (145, 24 *seqq.* Achelis-Flemming): "Jesus Christus . . . entschlief, um Abraham, Isaak und Jakob und allen seinen Heiligen . . . zu predigen".

Though in general Tert.'s views about this subject are very similar to those of Irenaeus, we may adduce one passage he has particularly made use of. As we have already observed, in Eph. 4, 9 he applies

the words τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς to hell, after which he remarks: *habes . . . regionem inferum subterraneam credere*; from this we may conclude that he is acquainted with the other interpretation of these words, which refers the κατώτερα μέρη to the earth (for references, see Clemen, 164 and Gschwind, 169₁₀), and wants to refute it. Exactly the same is found in Iren. 5, 31, 2. In § 1 Ir. attacks *quidam ex his qui putantur recte credidisse*, but in reality are *haereticos sensus in se habentes* and *supergradiuntur ordinem promotionis iustorum, et modos mediationis ad incorruptelam ignorant* (the words become clear by Harvey's translation into Greek: καὶ ὑπερβαίνουσι τὴν τάξιν τῆς τῶν δικαίων προκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς τρόπους τῆς μελέτης τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἀγνοοῦσι): they refuse to believe in the resurrection of the flesh and presume that the soul ascends to heaven immediately after death. In confutation of this, Irenaeus refers to Christ's descent to hell, and among other passages quotes the apocryphal text from Jeremiah, Eph. 4, 13, and Ps. 85, 13 (used by Tert. in § 1). In § 2 he continues: *Si ergo Dominus legem mortuorum servavit* (Tert.: *huic quoque legi satisfecit forma humanae mortis apud inferos functus*), *ut fieret primogenitus a mortuis, et commoratus usque in tertiam diem in inferioribus terrae* (Eph. 4, 9; T. § 1: *Christo in corde terrae triduum mortis . . . expunctum*), *post deinde surgens in carne, ut etiam fixuras clavorum ostenderet discipulis, sic ascendit ad Patrem* ('only then'; T.: *nec ante ascendit in sublimiora caelorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum*), *quomodo non confundantur* (T.: *cubito pellere*; for similar 'embellishments' of the text of Irenaeus, see the prefaces to ch. 34 and 35 and the notes on 23, 1/2), *qui dicunt inferos quidem esse hunc mundum, qui sit secundum nos; interiorum autem hominum ipsorum derelinquentem hic corpus, in supercoelestem ascendere locum? Cum enim Dominus 'in medio umbrae mortis abierit'* (Ps. 22, 4), *ubi animae mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, et post resurrectionem assumptus est: manifestum est, quia et discipulorum eius, propter quos et haec operatus est Dominus, animae* (T.: *qui . . . non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas*) *abibunt in invisibilem locum, definitum eis a Deo, et ibi usque ad resurrectionem commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem* (T.: *expectandae resurrectionis solacium capere*) . . . *Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum* (T.: *servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum*).

It is indubitable that in § 2 Tert. has paraphrased this passage from Irenaeus. They both attack a certain group of Christians who contend that the words τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς in Eph. 4, 9 refer to the earth, and that the souls of all Christians (*fidelium* Tert., *discipulorum eius* Iren.) ascend to heaven immediately after death; against this they both allege Christ's descent to hell and assert that, just as Christ descended into hell and rose again thence, the Christians will stay in hell till the resurrection of the flesh.

On the other hand, Irenaeus does not mention those Christians who asserted that Christ had freed the patriarchs and prophets from the *infern*i, and regarded this fact as an argument for their conviction that the souls of all Christians were released from the necessity of

going there after death (§ 3: "*in hoc . . . Christus inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus*"; § 4: "*in paradiso (dormitio nostra), quo iam tunc et patriarchae et prophetae . . . ab inferis migraverint*"; the subjunctive *migraverint* shows that the relative clause has a causal meaning: "we are to stay in paradise, as is proved by the fact that . . ."). According to Schmidt (515/6 and 519/20), this group is identical with the *orthodoxi* confuted by Irenaeus and by Tert. in § 2. But this is impossible, for the former presumed that Christ never entered hell because a *regio inferum subterranea* does not exist, whereas the latter did not question these facts, but used them as an argument for their theory that the souls of all Christians ascend to heaven immediately after death. The words "*in hoc Christus inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus*" become quite senseless, if *inferi* is regarded as a denomination of the earth. Hence we must assume a sharp division between § 2 and § 3 (this is overlooked by Schmidt, 515; if need be, we may also say that *illos* in § 2 denotes both groups, as they both presumed (though on different grounds) that the souls of Christians do not enter a *regio inferum subterranea*, but this is less probable, because throughout § 2 Tert. is paraphrasing Irenaeus; Schmidt is also wrong in writing (*l. c.*): "Sie gehen von dem Grundsatz aus, dass es für die Seelen der fideles unwürdig sei, nach wie vor in die Unterwelt hinabzusteigen um dort in sinu Abrahae expectandae resurrectionis solatium capere": it is much less probable that these Christians ever mentioned the *sinus Abrahae* than that these words contain a conclusion drawn by Tert. himself (to whom the conception *sinus Abrahae* was highly important): "such people scorn the idea of an abode in Abraham's bosom!").

In the time of Tert. the adherents of the theory confuted in §§ 3/4, which in later times became the common view (for Origen, see Schmidt, 527 and 543), are mentioned by him only. It remains very surprising that Irenaeus does not say anything about them; this may perhaps lead us to suppose (though it is not very probable) that Tert. here does not contest an existing theory, but only supposes that once this conclusion may be drawn from the belief that Christ delivered the patriarchs and prophets from hell. In this case we must regard *inquunt* in § 3 as an example of the *occupatio*, which plays so prominent a part in his works (see Quispel, 85/93), and of which an instance may be found in 35, 5: *Spero . . . repraesentati* (see the comm.).

It is curious that with regard to the fate of the patriarchs and prophets Tert. agrees with Marcion, who contended (Iren. 1, 25, 2; Theodoret. *haer. fab.* 1, 24; Epiphan. *Panar.* 42, 4; cf. Schmidt, 481/3; Harnack, *Marcion*, 294*/5* and 371*; Gschwind, 82 and 231₂; Bauer, 250) that, whereas Cain, the Sodomites, the Egyptians, and generally all pagans were delivered from hell by the descent of Christ, the just, such as Abel, Enoch and Noah, together with the patriarchs and prophets, did not obtain salvation at that moment, because they feared it was another temptation from the part of their God, and so kept aloof from Jesus (Iren. 1, 25, 2; Theodoret. *haer. fab.* 1, 24; Epiphan. *Panar.* 42, 4; cf. Schmidt, 481/3; Harnack, *Marcion*, 294*/5*

and 371*; Gschwind, 82 and 231₃; Bauer, 250). Neither here nor in *Adversus Marcionem* Tert. mentions this view of Marcion, which he must have known, if only on account of his having read Irenaeus; apparently it annoyed him to agree to a certain extent with his greatest enemy (there is of course a difference, for according to Marcion the just, etc. are never to be freed from hell).

1. **Nobis**: for the *dat. auctoris*, cf. 6, 4. — **cavositas** (κοῦλα Pl. *Phaedo* 109 B) is found in only one other passage (*pud.* 20 (267, 22. 26) = Levit. 14, 36 *seq.*). — **subdivalis** seems to occur here for the first time (*subdialis* from Plin. *n. h.* 34, 117 downwards). A subst. *subdival* (*subdiale* Plin.) is found in *adv. Iud.* 11, 35: *in subdival domus* (Ezech. 9, 3; LXX εἰς τὸ ἀλθριον τοῦ οἴκου, Vulg. *ad limen domus*), *subdivum* (Tp.) in *pall.* 2, 2. — **mundi** again refers to the elements, not to the earth (cf. the note on 54, 4: *mundialium*). — **visceribus**: *viscera terrae* is often found in poetry from Ovid *met.* 1, 138 downwards. — **in corde terrae**: from Matth. 12, 40 which is also adduced in Iren. 5, 31, 1; *inferioribus abyssis*: Ps. 85, 12 (Iren., *loc. cit.*). For *expunctum*, cf. 22, 1, for *abyssis*, Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 20, 5 (*Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 79).

2. **Christus deus, quia et homo**: according to Tert., in Christ *deus* and *homo* were simply joined together: *deum et hominem . . . secundum utramque substantiam in sua proprietate distantem* (*adv. Prax.* 27 = 281, 20/2); *ib.* (l. 27/8): *videmus duplicem statum, non confusum, sed coniunctum, in una persona, deum et hominem Iesum*; 41, 3: *solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et deus Christus*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 12 (455, 14); cf. the note on 45, 3; d'Alès, *Théol.*, 198. Referring to the treatise *adv. Prax.*, Lietzmann, *G. A. K.*, 2, 228 rightly observes: "Er freut sich, diese Formeln vor dem Leser auszubreiten, aber sie sind ihm nicht aus innerer Notwendigkeit erwachsen und haben mit seinem religiösen Leben keine Verbindung". The words *quia et homo*, ἅτε καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὢν (cf. 5, 4 n.), motivate *huic quoque legi satisfecit. huic . . . legi = legi mortis* (cf. 50, 2); *mortis* must be supplied from the preceding *mortuus*. For the contents of this paragraph, see the preface to this chapter. *Satisfecit*: for the conception of *satisfactio*, which to Tert. is of the highest importance, cf. Beck, 69. — **sublimiora caelorum** instead of *caelum* (Io. 3, 13) is due to *inferiora terrarum* (Eph. 4, 9); the same scriptural passages are connected in *adv. Prax.* 30 (288, 2/3): *filius ascendit in superiora caelorum, qui et descendit in interiora* (Kroymann supposes *inferiora*) *terrae*. The plural *terrarum* is due to the *clausula* (I γ) and to parallelism (*caelorum*; for this plural, cf. 23, 1). — **compotes sui faceret**: „to make them acquainted with Him”; cf. the preface (p. 555; a different interpretation is found in Thes. l. L. III: 2137, 11). This meaning of *compos* is often found in Tert.'s writings, e. g. *pud.* 10 (239, 16/7): *civitatem profanam, nondum dei compotem . . . ignorantia delinquentem*; c. *Chr.* 22, 6; *adv. Herm.* 22 (151, 4/7): *si tantam curam instructioni nostrae insumpsit spiritus sanctus, ut sciremus quid unde processerit, nonne proinde nos et de caelo et de terra compotes reddidisset?*; *iei.* 9 (285, 3/4): *occultorum compotes faciunt*;

adv. Marc. 1, 10 (303, 7); *pall.* 2, 5; *scorp.* 12 (172, 10); *an.* 2, 2 and 34, 3 (for *compos* = *compos mentis*, cf. the note on 45, 4). Cf. the use of *particeps* in Catull. 55, 22: *dum vestri sinu particeps amoris* (see Kroll's note on this passage). — *habes . . . credere*: cf. 32, 4. — *non . . . inferis dignas*: "too good for hell", cf. 56, 8 and Plato *Gorg.* 523 B: ὅτι φοιτῶν σφιν ἄνθρωποι ἐκατέρωσε (viz. to Hades and to the isles of the blessed) ἀνάξιοι. — *servi . . . magistrum*: Tert. alludes to Matth. 10, 24, whereas Irenaeus here (cf. p. 556) quotes Luc. 6, 40 (Schmidt, 520₂). For *si forte*, see the note on 8, 5. — *Abrahae sinu*: Iren. only says *invisibilem locum, definitum . . . a Deo*; the mentioning of the *sinus Abrahae* here is due to Tert.'s polemics against Marcion (see the preface to ch. 7). The thought: "that which the *dominus* and *magister* have suffered, the *servi* and *discipuli* must suffer too", is a rather common one in the writings of this period; cf. the note on 50, 4: (*dei*) *mortem per martirium quoque flagitantis* (sc. ab hominibus), *quam de Christo etiam suo exegit*, and especially *scorp.* 9 (163, 21/7): *et ideo: non est discipulus super magistrum, statim sequitur, nec servus super dominum suum, quia cum magister et dominus ipse perpessus sit persecutionem et traditionem et occisionem, multo magis servi et discipuli eadem expendere debebunt, ne quasi superiores exempti de iniquitate videantur, quando hoc ipsum sufficere eis ad gloriam debeat, aequari passionibus domini et magistri. Si forte* contains a sneer again (cf. 8, 5): "if at least such bad Christians are to be regarded as serious candidates for a dwelling in Abraham's bosom!"

3. "Sed . . . adiremus": cf. the preface, p. 555. — Kroymann's conjecture *animam exhalabis* seems to be preferable here. It is true that we often find an intransitive sense of *exhalare* (see the note on 54, 4), and that sometimes this verb even has the meaning 'animam efflare' (Ovid met. 7, 581: *hic illic, ubi mors deprenderat, exhalantes*; Anon. *Vales.* 16, 96: *antequam exhalaret* (but *animam exalaret* P); *Vitae patr. Iurens.* (MG Merov. III) 1, 19 (143, 12); *Vict. Vit.* 3, 31: *alii . . . spiritum continuo reddiderunt, alii post paululum exalaverunt* may also be interpreted in another way), but the conception of an *anima ipsa se exhalans* is rather surprising; moreover, Tert. in this chapter often addresses his adversaries directly. — *nondum . . . audito*: this scriptural passage has been altered to a great extent by Tert. The original text has: ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ, καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ (Vulg.: *quoniam ipse Dominus in iussu, et in voce Archangeli et in tuba Dei descendet de caelo*). In *res.* 24 (59, 13/5) Tert. gives a faithful translation which is identical with the Vulgate (only *tuba* instead of *in tuba*), whereas *ib.* 41 (86, 7/8) he writes: *g. i. d. in iussu et voce tubae dei descendet de caelo* (MF; the reading of P seems to be an adaptation to the text of the Vulgate, cf. Kroymann's critical note). Now, in *Adamant.* 1, 25 we read ἐν κελεύσματι θεοῦ, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι καταβήσεται κύριος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ (Rufin.: *in iussu dei, in voce archangeli, in novissima tuba descendet de coelis*); it is

highly probable that the text was quoted in this form by the adherents of Marcion (Harnack, *Marcion*, 112*). Hence it may perhaps be concluded that in this passage *dei iussu* is to be regarded as a reminiscence of the Bible of Marcion. — *obviam* . . . *aerem*: this text is quoted in a slightly varied form in *adv. Marc.* 5, 15 (628, 8/11); *res.* 24 (59, 15/18) and 41 (86, 8/10). — *patet caelum*: this combination is found fairly often, e. g. *ad nat.* 1, 10, 30; 2, 10, 12; 2, 13, 10; *scorp.* 10 (167, 11). *transactio* seems to be found in this place only in the sense of *consummatio*.

4. *dormitio* 'resting-place' (cf. 54, 1: *in supernis mansionibus*; for a different interpretation, see the note on *cum Endymionibus Stoicorum*); in this sense this word does not occur very often (Thes. l. L. V, 1: 2034, 62/74); we may add some passages from Christian epitaphs, e. g. 3236 Diehl. The meaning 'sleep of death' is much more common (e. g. *res.* 24 = 59, 7; see Thes., *loc. cit.*, 13/56; Teeuwen, 43 *seqq.*; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 121; Rönsch, *It*², 73. 312). — *in aethere* . . . *Stoicorum* repeats 54, 2; see the preface to ch. 54, p. 548. — *puerariis*: Tp.; Gloss. II: 164, 24: *puerarius παιδεράστης* (*ib.* 392, 6: *παιδεράστης pullarius*). — *cum Endymionibus Stoicorum*: a thoroughly wrong interpretation is given by La Cerda: 'quia et ipsi (viz. the Stoics) dormirent cum dormientes suos, hoc est, defunctos ad Lunae gremium referant'. Just as the *puerarii Platonis*, the *Endymiones Stoicorum* belong to the *animae sapientes*, who stay in *supernis mansionibus* (54, 1). The name *Endymiones* has been chosen, firstly, because they *sub lunam sublimantur* (54, 2), secondly, because in the foregoing passage the word *dormitio* has been used; moreover, the souls of the wise are in this way represented as sleepy (cf. the note on 36, 1: *illum sermonem Platonis veterinosum*) and dissolute, for *Endymion* (just like *Ganymedes*) occurs sometimes in the sense of 'minion' (Juven. 10, 318/9; Apul. *met.* 1, 12; note the preceding *puerariis*); Tert. often uses words or names with a twofold sense (see the note on 28, 1: *divinior*). It is not altogether out of the question that a reminiscence of Varro's *Endymiones* is to be stated here (in the almost contemporary treatise *de pallio* Tert. has used the *Satura Menippea* on a large scale; cf. Geffcken, *Kynika und Verwandtes*), as was supposed already by Diels, Rh. Mus. N. F. 34 (1879), 489. More is to be found in the article of P. Boyancé, *Les Endymions de Varron* (Rev. Ét. Anc. 41 (1939), 319/24), who gives this interpretation of the fragments that one of the Stoic 'Endymions' descends from the *sublunare* in a thunder-storm and lands among a revelling party. This interpretation is supported by the fact that, according to another fragment of Varro (Aug. *civ. dei* 7, 6), the heroes, *lares*, or *genii* stay *inter lunae* . . . *gyrum et nimborum ac ventorum cacumina* (cf. also K. Mras, Neue Jahrb. 33 (1914), 394). On the other hand, Boyancé seems to be wrong in translating (p. 322) *dormitio* in this passage by 'sleep' and in connecting it with Varro frag. V (105): *animum mitto speculatum*. — *appendices*: Tert. seems to have liked this word; cf. *iei.* 17 (296, 26): *appendices scilicet gulae lascivia atque luxuriae*; *res.* 8 (37, 7); *adv. Val.* 10 (189, 9; for

this passage, see A. d'Alès, *Rev. Ét. Gr.* 29 (1916), XLVIII/XLIX); *adv. Marc.* 1, 25 (325, 10); the only other instance in which it refers to human beings is found in *Liv.* 21, 5, 11: *Carpetanorum cum appendicibus Olcadum Vaccaeorumque. — migraverint*: the relative clause has causal force, as is shown by the subjunctive; cf. the preface, p. 557. — **Et quomodo**: cf. 7, 2. — **Iohanni . . . altari**: since the heavenly altar is meant (see the note on 9, 8), this passage may be regarded as an argument for the assertion that according to Tert., paradise is situated in heaven (see preface, p. 554). — **sub die passionis**, etc.: this sentence raises a problem, as two (or rather three: cf. C. J. M. J. van Beek, *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, 1 (Noviomagi 1936), 149*₂) passages from the *Passio Perpetuae* may have been mentioned here, viz. 13, 8 (vision of Saturus): *et coepimus illic multos fratres cognoscere, sed et martyras* (gr.: ἀλλά γε καὶ τοὺς μάρτυρας); 11, 9 (*id.*): *Ibi invenimus Iocundum et Saturninum et Artaxium, qui eadem persecutione vivi arserunt, et Quintum, qui et ipse martyr in carcere exierat. Et quaerebamus de illis, ubi essent ceteri*; 4, 8 (vision of Perpetua): *Et vidi spatium immensum horti et in medio sedentem hominem canum, in habitu pastoris, grandem, oves mulgentem: et circumstantes candidati milia multa* (περτειστήκεισαν δὲ αὐτῷ πολλὰι χιλιάδες λευχειμο-νούντων). Dölger (*ACH* 2 (1930), 40₁) and Labriolle (*Crise Mont.*, 341₁) suppose that Tert. erroneously attributes the vision of Saturus to Perpetua, whereas according to d'Alès (*Rev. d'hist. ecclés.* 8 (1907), 13/4), the vision of Perpetua may be meant here indeed. For this view he adduces the following arguments: by *candidati* (4, 8) the martyrs are obviously meant; in 13, 8 Saturus does not see *solos martyras*, as does Perpetua in the passage from Tert., but “also martyrs”. He, however, also reckons with the possibility that Tert. does not refer here to the text of the *Passio*, and wants to advance the better-known name of Perpetua, especially because the Montanists liked to refer to revelations received by women (cf. 9, 4). Finally, he admits that an error of Tert. is not out of the question, because *de anima* was written six years after the martyr's death of Perpetua. In the main the same view is held by Armitage Robinson, *The Passio of Perpetua* (Texts and Studies vol. I, No. 2, Cambridge 1891), 55. H. Délehay, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires* (Bruxelles 1921), 66₃ thinks it possible that in *Pass. Perpet.* 13, 8 the reading of several manuscripts *coepimus illic multos fratres cognoscere martyres* contains the original text; in that case the vision of Saturus would exactly correspond with this passage. In my opinion, it is necessary to decide first of all whether we are to retain the reading of A (*martyras*) or to follow Gelenius (*commartyres*). Now the context seems to show that we must stick to the *lectio tradita*. Tert. says: “revelations have shown that in paradise there are only martyrs: *Iohanni . . . paradisi regio revelata . . . nullas alias animas apud se praeter martyrum ostendit*”. Hence it would be surprising, if Perpetua should only see her ‘fellow-martyrs’, by which must be meant, not ‘her colleagues, the martyrs’, but ‘the victims of the same persecution’, for *commartyr*, which occurs only four times, always has this sense: *Pass. Perpet.* 15, 3: *sed et*

commartyres (οἱ συμμάρτυρες αὐτῆς) *graviter contristabantur*; *Pass. Montani* 7; *Acta Perpet.* A 3, 1 (62, 1/2 van Beek) and 7, 2 (70, 11/2). The reading of A is also supported by what follows: *solos illic martyras vidit, nisi quia nullis romphaea paradisi ianitrix cedit, nisi qui in Christo decesserint*. For all I see, nothing prevents us from applying this sentence to the *candidati multa milia* in the vision of Perpetua. If, on the other hand, we read *commartyres* (here we should not forget that this is almost certainly a conjecture, which however is supported to a certain extent by the circumstance that B has *contra martyras* and that this word occurs in the *Passio Perpetuae*), we are not entitled to identify these 'fellow-martyrs' with the *candidati* who are victims of earlier persecutions, and are forced to state an error of Tert., as has been supposed by Dölger and Labriolle. — *sub die passionis* here = *sub diem passionis*, as is shown by the *Passio Perpetuae*; for *sub*, see the note on 48, 1. *revelatio* (probably Tp; not mentioned by Hoppe, *Beitr.*) is an 'integral Christianity'; cf. Matzkow, 16/8. — *romphaea* is found from Livy downwards; it also occurs in *fuga* 11, 2 (Zach. 13, 7; LXX ῥομφαία; Vulg. *framea*). In *Evang. Nicodem.* II, 10 (26) (p. 310 Tischendorf) the robber who has been admitted into paradise says: καὶ ἰδοῦσα ἡ φλογίνη ῥομφαία τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἤνοιξέ μοι, καὶ εἰσῆλθον. *ianitrix* used as an adjunct. is also found in *scorp.* 10 (167, 13): *potestates ianitrices*; cf. *ad nat.* 2, 15, 5: *numinum ianitorum*. — *nisi qui*: see the note on 17, 9. — *in Christo decesserint*, viz. the martyrs, as is proved by § 3: *qui mortui in Christo primi resurgent*, for the *prima resurrectio* applies to martyrs only (see the note on 58, 8). — *non in Adam*: according to Schmidt, 517, this refers to those Christians who are not martyrs. This is of course right, but it seems probable that Tert. also means the patriarchs and prophets, as the digression about revelations of paradise (*Et quomodo . . . vidit?*) must be regarded as a confutation of the preceding sentence in its entirety: *immo, . . . in paradiso* (sc. *dormitio nostra*), *quo iam tunc et patriarchae et prophetae . . . ab inferis migraverint*.

5. *extraordinaria* = *violenta*, cf. 52, 1: *extraordinariam* (sc. *formam mortis*) . . . *praeter naturam iudicans* (sc. *humanus affectus*), *violentis cuiusque finis*; martyrs are often denoted as βίαιοθάνατοι (more about this in the preface to ch. 56). — *privato* 'special', cf. e. g. *spect.* 17 (18, 20/1): *theatro . . . quod est privatum consistorium impudicitiae*. — *hospitio*: this word is often used by Cyprian in a similar context, e. g. *ad Demetr.* 19 (364, 21 H.): *aeternae vel mortis vel immortalitatis hospitia*; this idea harks back to Seneca, cf. Koch, *Cypr. Unters.*, 7 and 305. — *Agnosce*: this imperative is very common in Tert.'s writings of this period, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (339, 6); 2, 18 (360, 1); 3, 14 (400, 11); 4, 26 (511, 6); 4, 35 (539, 1); 5, 18 (639, 21). — *differentiam . . . morte*: the reference to martyrdom contains the answer to the question of the adversaries (§ 3): *Ceterum quod discrimen ethnicorum et Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem?* Upon this Schmidt observes (517₂): "Das ist aber wiederum ein geschickter Advokaten-

kniff, da ja nicht die verschiedene Todesart, sondern die Differenz in den Aufenthaltsorten der Toten zwischen Heiden und Christen in Frage steht. Es können doch nicht alle Christen den Märtyrertod erleiden". Schmidt forgets that Tert. speaks here as a Montanist, and as such has the ideal that all Christians may become martyrs indeed. — *paracletus*: for this conception, which to Tert. is of the utmost importance, see d'Alès, *Théol.*, 448/54 and S. A. Fries, *Z N T W* 12 (1911), 117. — *non . . . lectulis*: here Tert. alludes to the oracle of a Montanistic prophetess quoted in a more complete form in *fuga* 9, 4: *nolite in lectulis nec in aborsibus et febribus mollibus optare exire, sed in martyriis, uti glorificetur qui est passus pro vobis*. For this passage, cf. *mon.* 15: *utique enim illam magis excusari capit quae in proelio cecidit quam quae in cubiculo, quae in equuleo succubuit quam quae in lectulo, quae crudelitati cessit quam quae libidini, quae gemens devicta est quam quae subans*. For the similar conception that diseases are often just as painful as tortures (e. g. Sen. *ep.* 14, 6. 24, 14. 78, 14), see Weyman, *Christ.-Lat. Poesie*, 76/8; Lucifer Calaur. *Moriendum esse pro dei filio* 13; *Acta Apollon.* 28 (for this passage, cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 243,). The choice of *lectulus* may be due to the fact that this word was also used to denote an instrument of torture (Prud. *perist.* 5, 556; see P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Hagiographica* (Studi e testi 19, 1908), 135_g). — *clavis*: this is a repetition of *scorp.* 10 (167, 24/6): *nam elsi adhuc clausum putas caelum, memento claves eius hic dominum Petro et per eum ecclesiae reliquisse, quas hic unusquisque interrogatus atque confessus feret secum* (Tert. means the lawsuit which precedes martyrdom; see the discussion of this passage by Dölger, *ACh* 2 (1930), 124₂₃). This passage was imitated by Hier. *ep.* 129, 2, 1: *sanguis Christi clavis paradisi est*; *homil. in Luc.* 16, 19 *seqq.*: *cruz Christi clavis paradisi est*. From Tert.'s writings cf. *res.* 47 (98, 15/6): *in adventu domini, qui clavis est resurrectionis* (copied by [Orig.] *tract. script. sacr.* 17 = 184, 2/3 Batiff.-Wilm.); *adv. Marc.* 4, 27 (515, 18) and 4, 28 (516, 15). — *sanguis* is a very common designation of martyrdom; the following passages are worth mentioning: *cor.* 1, 18/9: *rufatus sanguinis sui spe*; *scorp.* 12 (173, 23/5): *illorum . . . victoriae, quorum et pugnae, eorum vero pugnae, quorum et sanguis*; *Pass. Perpet.* 18, 3: *Felicitas, salvam se peperisse gaudens ut ad bestias pugnaret, a sanguine ad sanguinem, ab obstetrice ad retiarium* (cf. *Acta Perpet.* A 9, 2); [Cypr.] *de laude marty.* 9: *sanguini nostro patet caelum*; *ib.* 26: *cedant tamen necesse est martyrio universa ac sanguini summittanturque cruori*; *Martyr. Mariani et Iacobi* 4, 4: *ut dei dignationem Mariani et Iacobi iustus sanguis expleret*; Hier. *homil. in Luc.* 16, 19 *seqq.*: *habet et sanguis . . . loca sua*. For the designation of martyrdom as *lavacrum sanguinis* (from Melito Sard. downwards, see Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, I, p. 142; Tert.: *scorp.* 6 (158, 10); *bapt.* 16, 1; *pat.* 13 = 21, 4), cf. Dölger *ACh* 2 (1930), 117 *seqq.*; Windisch, *Taufe*, 414/5; Achelis, 2, 439. — *Habes . . . libellum*: A reads *habet*. It is very improbable that Tert. has used *habet* followed by an accus. in the sense of 'il y a' (though here this reading might receive a certain support from *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (618, 1): *de paradiso suus stilus est* "there is a special

book about paradise”), firstly, because *habes* (which in *de anima* occurs four times, see 13, 3) is required by the context (*agnosce, tuus*), secondly, because this use of *habet* appertains to the last period of the Latin language (the first instance seems to occur in *S H A Tacit.* 8, 1: *habet in bibliotheca Ulpia librum elephantinum*); it is particularly common in the *Itineraria* (from this we must distinguish such cases as Hier. *Quaest. Hebr. in Genes.* 46, 28: *in Hebraeo nec urbem habet Heroum*, where *textus* is to be supplied as a subject; for a different interpretation, see Goelz., *Jér.*, 422); cf. Thes. l. L. VI, 3: 2461, 78 *seqq.*; Hofm., *Synt.*, 622; Löfst., *Per.*, 43/4 and *Verm. Stud.*, 136₂; Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 119; Geyer, 63/4; Regnier, 29; Süss, *Stud.*, 96/7; Svenn., *Pallad.*, 475. 567₃ and *Oribas.*, 84; Wölfflin, A. L. L. 4, 271. — *de paradiso*: this treatise is mentioned in *adv. Marc.* 5, 12 (618, 1/2; cf. the preceding note) and in the table of contents of the Codex Agobardinus. — *sequestrari*: cf. 14, 5.

56. *The souls descend to hell immediately after death.*

“Now we have to discuss, in the first place, if the souls enter hell immediately after death or not, secondly, if they may return from there, either of their own accord or by order (§ 1). — I. It is generally presumed that the souls of the unburied cannot enter hell; as an instance the soul of Patroclus is adduced, which in the *Iliad* begs for a speedy burial of the body. But with regard to Homer we must always reckon with poetic licence; it is possible, too, that he wished to expedite burial to prevent that one should see the decay of the dead bodies and that mourning should be protracted too long (§ 2). It is absurd to think that the soul waits for the interment of the body; for the rest, a postponement of this can only be welcome to it. If, however, this delay is detrimental in spite of all, it is surely not the soul which must do penance for the remissness of the relatives! (§ 3). — II. Further it is said that those who died prematurely must roam about here, till they have passed through the time fixed for the duration of their stay on earth. Now, either this time was definitely fixed (in this case there is no such thing as an untimely death), or it was fixed, but afterwards shortened by some external influence (in this case the curtailment is non-existent, if nevertheless the soul has to await the completion of its time), or again this time was not fixed: then it is no longer necessary to pass through a ‘remnant of time’ (§ 4). Now, if a man who was to have lived for eighty years dies as a child, how are we to conceive his soul to spend the interim? How can it grow older outside the body? Besides, we Christians must consider that at the resurrection of the flesh the soul enters the same body it left at death; hence we may suppose that after death it retains the same age (for the age depends on the body and the body at the resurrection has remained the same), so that it is impossible that the soul of somebody who died as a child, is eighty years old at the resurrection — and moreover enters the body of a little child! (§ 5). And how are we to imagine that a soul without

a body runs through the entire course of a man's life? (§ 6). Is not that 'a life without a life'? And why should so useless a life not be spent in hell? So we draw the conclusion that till Doomsday every soul retains the age which it possessed at the moment of death (§ 7). — III. Lastly those who have died a violent death are thought to be excluded from hell, in the first place all people who have been executed. But executions are ordered by justice and for this reason are not to be regarded as acts of violence! To this our opponents may reply: "but such souls are not admitted into hell, because they are bad". Now either hell is bad, and then criminals too must be admitted, or it is good, in which case it is absurd to exclude from it those who have died an untimely death, as these are mostly innocent souls (§ 8)".

In this chapter Tert. refutes the view that the souls of the ἄτατοι, the ἄωποι, and the βίαιοθάνατοι (βίαιοι, βιοθανεῖς, βιοθάνατοι, cf. Radermacher, *N T Gramm.*², 37) are not admitted into hell and must wander about on earth for a certain time. So far as the ἄτατοι are concerned, this persuasion is a very old one and occurs already in Homer (Patroclus, *Il.* 23, 71 *seqq.*; Elpenor, *Odyss.* 11, 51 *seqq.*), as is also observed by Tert. In later times it was widely-spread (e. g. Soph. *Antig.* 1070; Eur. *Troad.* 1084/5; Isocr. 14, 55; particularly frequent in the *papyri magicae*, for which see Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1,87 = § 357 *seqq.*). The Romans seem to have borrowed this conception from the Greeks (cf. H. Wagenvoort, *Imperium* (Amsterdam 1941), 31); at all events, Vergil *Aen.* 6, 325 *seqq.* (where the interim of 100 years forms part of the doctrine of metempsychosis: Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 10/1) uses Greek sources, and the scene of the ghost-story related by Plin. *ep.* 7, 27 is laid in Athens. For more details, see Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 412/3; Hopfner, *loc. cit.*; Cumont, *Afterlife*, 64/9. As is known, Seneca often combats the opinion that it is a terrible thing to stay unburied (e. g. *ben.* 5, 20, 4; *ep.* 92, 34/5; *de remed. fort.* 5); perhaps one of his arguments may be found back in this chapter (see the note on § 2).

Of a somewhat later date (at all events not occurring in Homer) is the view that the ἄωποι, i. e. people snatched away by a θάνατος ἄωρος (or ἄνωρος: Harder, *Ocell. Lucan.*, 143; Lat. *mors immatura* or *acerba* (see H. Armini, *Eran.* 19 (1919/20), 45 *seqq.*), or even *cruda*: Gloss. IV: 436, 21: *cruda morte, id est ante diem*; *C. I. L.* VIII, 11433 and X, 663) are forbidden to enter hell. This conception is found for the first time in the works of the tragic poets (e. g. Soph. *Antig.* 896: πρίν . . . μοῖραν ἐξήκειν βίου; Eur. *Alc.* 168 *seq.* and frag. 392 N.), but not until the Hellenistic period does it become common, when it occurs mostly in epitaphs and magic papyri. Cf. Salmasius, *Plinianae exercitationes*, 787/8 (where all important details are to be found already, though most of our data were unknown to him); Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 411/2; S. Reinach, *A R W* 9 (1906), 312 *seqq.*; Hopfner, *op. cit.*, 84/5 (§§ 348/50); W. H. Roscher, *Kynanthropie*, 40/1; Rüsche, *Blut, Leben und Seele*, 68 *seqq.*; W. Schulze, *Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1912, 695₅; Gruppe, *Gr. Mythol.*, 760/1. Into Latin literature

this subject was introduced (apart from the short mention in Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 93) by the beautiful verses of Vergil, *Aen.* 6, 426/9; see for this passage Norden, *Verg. Aen.* VI³, 11 and 41/3. N. denotes the Pythagoreans as the probable *auctores* of this conception (*ib.* 11₂), and supposes that both Vergil and Tert. have become acquainted with it through the intermediary of Posidonius. The first supposition may be right, though no sufficient proof has been furnished (the most important arguments are that Plato touches upon this subject in a passage (*Resp.* 10, 615 C) in which he may have used Pythagorean sources, and that in Lucian. *Philopseudes* 29 it is a Pythagorean who mentions the βαιοθάνατοι); as to the second, cf. the continuation. That the souls of the ἄωροι must wander about till they have fulfilled the term of life fixed for them, is only related by Tert. and by Servius (*in Aen.* 4, 386): *dicunt physici biothanatorum animas non recipi in originem suam, nisi vagantes legitimum tempus fatis compleverint*. An interesting parallel from a much later period is furnished by a text of Geiler von Kaisersberg, attention to which was drawn by L. Weniger (A R W 9 (1906), 220): "Also redt der gemeine Man von dem Wütischen Heer, dass die, die vor den Zeiten sterben, ee denn dass inen Got hat uffgesetzt, als die, die in die Reis laufen und erstochen werden, oder gehenkt und ertrenkt werden, die müssen also lang nach irem todt laufen, bis das zil kumpt, das inen Got gesetzt hat und dann so würkt Got mit inen, was sein Göttlicher Wil ist".

The βαιοθάνατοι are really no more than a subsection of the ἄωροι, but soon a differentiation was made by sentiment (which in these matters is more powerful than logic). According to this differentiation, the ἄωροι included only children and those who had died unmarried and childless, the ἄγαμοι and ἄτεκνοι (see the note on § 8), the βαιοθάνατοι those only who at a more mature age had met a violent death (see the literature quoted for the ἄωροι, and Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 264₁. 2, 412/3; Hopfner, *op. cit.*, 1, 82/4 = §§ 335/48).

Concerning the subsections of the βαιοθάνατοι, a certain disagreement seems to have existed. Tert. mentions only those who had been executed, but this is due to a special cause: he wants to make out that all ἄωροι are innocent souls and all βαιοθάνατοι criminals, to prevent that these groups are regarded as being of the same kind (§ 8; the interpretation of this passage by H. Weil, *Études sur l'antiquité grecque* (Paris 1900), 88, is wrong; see the commentary). For the divisions which occur in Verg. *Aen.* 6, 430/547 and Lucian. *catapl.* 5, cf. my discussion in *Mnemos.* III ser., 13 (1947), 123/24 and the article 'Biothanati', R A C 1, 1167/70.

Since for Tert.'s argument it is highly important to represent the βαιοθάνατοι as evil souls, he purposely suppresses the fact that the martyrs, too, belonged to this group, and indeed were often regarded as belonging to it. Among pagan authors this has been clearly stated by Julian. *Apost.* (*ep.* 89b, p. 155 Bidez; for more details, see Labriolle, *Ré. pai.*, 419); the Christians too (Cumont, *Afterlife*, 146) and even Christ (*Mart. Cononis* 4, 6; *Pass. Pionii* 13, 3) were called by this name. It seems unthinkable that Tert. did not know this; where it

is useful to his argument, he remembers quite well that the mob called the Christians *sarmenticii* (*apol.* 50, 3). It is also for the purpose of defending the martyrs that Pionius asserts (*Pass. Pion.* 13, 7) that self-murderers only are βιοθανεῖς.

It seems hardly possible to say anything definite about the sources used in this and the subsequent chapter. If we are right in supposing (see the preface to chapter 54) that Soranus, though he himself considered the soul to be mortal, in Περὶ ψυχῆς also discussed eschatology for the sake of completeness, Tert. may have borrowed his materials from him. On the other hand, we are not to lose sight of the fact that in Tert.'s time everybody was familiar with the conceptions dealt with in this chapter, as is shown by the papyri, so that it does not seem necessary to seek for a definite source. Norden's assertion (*op. cit.*, 41/2) that Posidonius here, too, played an important part as intermediary, will not be accepted any more by whoever has read the books of Reinhardt and Heinemann.

1. *Occurrit*: similarly, 25, 1: *an . . . quaestio occurrat*. — *interim*: 'provisionally'; cf. 9, 7. — *ex arbitrio vel ex imperio*: this is discussed in ch. 57.

2. *suasoriae* (-a Scal.) must be retained, cf. *iei.* 2 (276, 25); *suasoria* as a subst. occurs from Petron. and Quintil. downwards. — The reading *insepultos* (-as B) seems to be supported by the name *Patroclum* in the next part of the sentence; the soul does not form part of the discussion yet (§ 1, where the souls are mentioned, is to be regarded as a preface to ch. 56/7). — *non . . . quam* = *non ante . . . quam*, which is much rarer than the sense *non post . . . quam* (this use occurs from Nepos 3, 1, 5 downwards; cf. Kühn.-Stegm., I, 405). Löfstedt, Glotta 3 (1912), 187, adduces *Mulom. Chir.* 530 (173, 22 Oder): *iumentum bene abstinere ab aqua uno die et nocte, quam deponas iumentum*, and compares Plaut. *Amphitruo* 91: *anno = anno ante* and *Per. Aether.* 16, 7: (mansiones) *per quas ieramus tres (= ante tres) annos*. W. A. Baehrens, *Eran.* 13 (1913), 25 refers to Varro *r. r.* 3, 9, 20: *bis die cibum dant, observantes ex quibusdam signis, ut prior sit concoctus quam secundum dent* (here, of course, Varro wanted to avoid *prior . . . prius*) and *Visio Pauli* 16 (*Apocr. Anecd.*, James I, p. 18, 21): *non te dimittam quam ab odierna die scio quia alienus tibi factus sum (quam M S; antequam James)*. Cf. also Dictys 4, 13 (Hofm., *Synt.*, 731) and perhaps Colum. 12, 18, 6: *conpluris dies quam* (S; *antequam* all editors; see Dahllöf, 108). — *non alias* = *non aliquin*, cf. 25, 2. — *poeticae iura*, viz. the *licentia poetica* (see 57, 12). The reading given in A (*poeticae*; -ca B Gel.) is certainly right, for there is an antithesis *poëticae iura . . . pietatis industriam*; *poetica* as a subst. also occurs in *ad nat.* 2, 7, 10; 2, 13, 17; *frag. Fuld.* § 6. — *collocavit*: cf. 20, 6. — *Tanto . . . ineusavit*: the meaning of this sentence becomes clear by a comparison with the next sentence: Homer in his *pietas* wished to maintain the funeral honours given to the bodies of the dead (*curam sepulturae collocavit — honor corporum servetur*) and to prevent people from

mourning too long (*ne quis . . . nutriti — memoria affectuum temperetur*). To attain this he introduced the complaining soul of Patroclus and in this way represented as harmful to the souls a delaying of the interment, which on the one hand might deflect people's thoughts from looking after the funeral, on the other might induce them to mourn too long (*quanto . . . incusavit ∞ instantia funeris*): as to the sense this clause is the more important one; Tert. might also have written: *moram sepulturae iniuriosam animabus incusavit, ut curam sepulturae collocaret, simul et ne . . . nutriti*). In his refutation (§ 3) Tert. only takes into account the words *moram . . . incusavit* and *ut . . . honor corporum (corporis iusta § 3) servetur*, and neglects the second argument (*ut . . . memoria affectuum temperetur*), which he may have regarded as rather a strong one. — *etiam* after *quanto* is to be regarded as a pleonasm; cf. the note on I, 6: *tanto scilicet et perosioris, quanto plenioris*. — *iniuriosam . . . incusavit*: a similar *abundantia sermonis* as occurs in 17, 2: *angustiores . . . infamet*. — *ne quis . . . nutriti*: these words may contain an allusion to *Il.* 24, 128 *segg.*, where Thetis calls upon Achilles not to mourn endlessly for Patroclus. — *instantia*: 'immediate occurrence', as found in *orat.* 4 (183, 26): *sub instantiam passionis*. — *honor corporum servetur*: though the more probable interpretation is "*ut corpora funeris sollemnibus honorentur*" (*∞ tanto magis . . . curam sepulturae collocavit*), it is not altogether out of the question that the sense is: "in order that the beauty of the bodies be preserved" = "lest people should see the decay of the dead bodies". For this sense of *honor*, cf. e. g. *res.* 12 (40, 25): *funestatur mundi honor*; in this case we may compare *Sen. de remed. fort.* 5, 4: *non defunctorum causa sed vivorum inuenta est sepultura ut corpora et visu foeda et odore amoverentur*. — *affectuum* = *amorum* (see 16, 6); cf. e. g. *Catull.* 96, 3/4: *quo desiderio veteres renovamus amores / atque olim missas flemus amicitias*. It is possible too, though less probable, that *affectus* has the concrete sense of 'the beloved' (it mostly refers to relatives, *C. E. L.* 1248 to a friend; cf. *Thes.* I. L. I: 1191, 73 *segg.*; *Svenn., Oros.*, 109/10; *Rochus*, 112; *Fassbender*, 58; this sense is a particularly common one in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (e. g. *Avid. Cass.* 7, 5. 8, 2; *Clod. Albin.* 10, 12; *Gordian.* 6, 3; *Maxim.* 23, 6) and in *Salvianus* (e. g. *ep.* 4, 4. 8. 9); for a similar use of *caritas*, see *Thes.* I. L. III: 462, 56/60; *Amm. Marc.* 18, 5, 2; 18, 8, 14; 28, 6, 4; *Hier. ep.* 79, 9). For this sentence and for the words *enormitate solacii dolore nutriti*, we may compare *Fulgent. Mitol.* 1, 1 (16, 11 *segg.* *Helm*): *denique doloris angustia quae semper inquiri necessitatis solatium filii sibi simulacrum in edibus instituit dumque tristitiae remedium quaerit, seminarium potius doloris invenit nesciens quod sola sit medicina miseriarum oblivio*.

3. *vanum*, *ut* also occurs in *res.* 26 (63, 3); *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (579, 26); *adv. Herm.* 30 (158, 27; with an infin. in *ad nat.* 1, 7, 26); for *Cypr.*, see *Schrijn.-Mohrm.*, 2, 97. — *sustineat* = *expectet*, as e. g. in *apol.* 35, 13 and *paen.* 6, 4 (cf. *Thierry*, 204); this sense (which perhaps is found already in *Martial.* 9, 3, 13: *expectes et sustineas, Auguste*,

necesse est) is a very common one in the Latin translation of Irenaeus; cf. Rönisch, *It.*², 381/2 and *Sem.*, 3, 81. — *quae . . . voluit*: the relative clause has causal force. — *pascitur luce* is a poetic phrase just as *vescitur aura* in Verg. *Aen.* 1, 546; *detrudere*, too, is at first used by poets only (from Verg. *Aen.* 7, 773; 9, 496 downwards) in connection with death (cf. Thes. l. L. V, 1: 843, 63 *seqq.*). — *titulus*: cf. 2, 5. — *imputabitur* (A B; *imputatur* Gel.) must be retained; for the use of a *futur. gnom.* in subordinate clauses, see the note on 10, 6.

4. *morte praeventas* is often found from Ovid *trist.* 5, 4, 32 downwards; in Tert. *praescr.* 30, 13. — *istie* = *hic* (viz. *in terra*), cf. 1, 1. — *reliquatio* is a law term (e. g. Paul. *dig.* 26, 7, 44, 1), just like *reliquatrix* 35, 1. — *quacum* (A B) must be retained, *pervixissent* being used as an intransitive verb here; we may paraphrase this sentence in the following way: “quam reliquationem praeter annos quos vixerunt si vixissent, pervixissent, i. e. spatium vitae fato destinatum peregissent”. Except in this passage *pervivere* occurs only in archaic Latin, where it is also used as an intransitive verb: Plaut. *Capt.* 742: *etsi pervivo usque ad summam aetatem*; Accius frag. 417: *Tun dia Medea es, cuius aditum expectans pervixi usque adhuc?* — *Porro . . . constitutorum*: instead of restricting himself to the discussion of two possibilities (the term of life was fixed in advance or not), Tert. subdivides the first, inasmuch as this fixed time remains intact or is ‘mutilated’ by some external influence. We do not see quite clearly which reasons have induced Tert. to make this subdivision (apart from the fact that he likes to make his arguments as impressive as possible); since he mentions the *voluntas dei*, he may have thought of the case of Ezechias, where we find the very reverse (IV Reg. 20, 6: *ut addam diebus tuis quindecim annos*). — *si iam impleri sustinentur* “if nevertheless their being fulfilled is awaited”. It is absolutely wrong to read *sustinent* as Gelenius and Reifferscheid do, because *sustinere* has the sense of ‘to await’, just as in § 3; we have a *nomin. cum infin.* after the passive form of *sustinere*. A perfect parallel is found in *scorp.* 3 (150, 25/6): *ita nec illud expectabitur retractari a nobis* and Cypr. *ep.* 30, 8: *interim, dum episcopus dari a Deo nobis sustinetur*. Cf. also *adv. Marc.* 5, 4 (579, 22): *ipsius erat sustinuisse tempus impleri* and *ib.* 1. 25/6: *quod efficeret tempus impleri et iam implendum sustineri*. A passive inf. after an active form of *sustinere* occurs in *test. an.* 5 (141, 28): *a prioribus instrui sustinebant* and in *adv. Herm.* 29 (157, 13). — *temporum non constitutorum*: the last two words are perfectly superfluous; in his arguments Tert. is very often digressive for the sake of clearness.

5. §§ 5/7 contain a completely new refutation (*Adhuc addam*) which consists of three arguments: a) it is impossible to grow older without a body, *quia per corpora operantur aetates*; b) an argument only meant for Christians: *N o s t r i autem illud quoque recogitent*, etc.: at the resurrection of the flesh the soul returns to the very same body it had left at the moment of death; now, if the body is the same, the

age (as may be deduced from a) is the same too; hence it is impossible that a soul which rises again in a month-old body is eighty years old itself: the age of the soul is dependent on the age of the body; c) if for a moment we suppose that the soul may grow older without a body, we are faced with new difficulties: for the course of life, which is due to the lapse of time, cannot be passed through by a bodiless soul; this would be a *vita sine vita* (moreover, so useless a life might as well be passed through in hell). In the conclusion Tert. shows, which argument he regards as the most valid one: every soul retains the age it possessed at the moment of death up to the resurrection, when it will receive the 'perfect age' mentioned in Eph. 4, 13. — *sub uberum fontibus* is repeated in *res.* 60 (121, 6); cf. *c. Chr.* 20, 47/8; *Lact. opif. dei* 12, 17; *Prudent. perist.* 10, 684; *Cyrril. Hieros. catech.* 9, 15; the reverse metaphor is still more common, e. g. [*Orig.*] *tract. de script. sacr.* 8 (90, 25 Batiff.-Wilm.): *ubera fontium*; *Paulin. Nol. carm.* 21, 782. 849; *Pausan.* 9, 34, 4; *Philo de opif. mundi* 38. 133; *1 Clem.* 20, 10 (cf. Knopf's note, *Hdb. N. T., Erg. Bd.*, p. 82); cf. M. Nink, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* (Philol. Suppl. 14 (1921), Heft 2), 10 *seqq.* — *puta* 'for instance' (from *Hor. sat.* 2, 5, 32; *Pers.* 4, 9 downwards) is very common in prose of the imperial age; from Tert. cf. *pud.* 22 (271, 25; also with *anaphora*); *iei.* 13 (292, 8); *adv. Marc.* 4, 30 (525, 4); cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 575; Rönisch, *It.*², 346 and *Sem.*, 2, 79. — *investis* 'under age' (Georges' wrongly gives the translation 'unmarried' for this passage); cf. Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 1, 125_g; F. Norden, *Apul. und das röm. Privatrecht*, 105₄. The original meaning (which still occurs in the two earliest instances, *Apul. apol.* 98 and *met.* 5, 28) is 'beardless'; in *pall.* 3, 4: *nudus . . . et investis* the meaning is 'without clothes'. In *orat.* 22 (194, 10/1; cf. *ib.* l. 15) Tert. plays upon the two meanings of the word: *sicut ergo in masculino sexu sub viri nomine etiam investis velari vetatur*; see also *v. v.* 8 and 11, and for Apuleius, Médan 169 and Bernhard, 192. *vesticeps* occurs from *Apul. apol.* 98 and *Gell.* 5, 19, 7 downwards. — *oetoginta*: perhaps La Cerda is right in supposing that the choice of this number is due to Ps. 89, 10: αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν ἡμῶν, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη, ἐὰν δὲ ἐν δυναστείαις, ὀγδοήκοντα ἔτη. — *ut . . . quale est*: see 24, 8. — *quia . . . aetates*: similarly, *Petr. Chrysol. serm.* 109 (501 B): *hoc (sc. corpus) aetates patitur*. On the other hand, Tert. in 24, 8 declares that the soul also during its previous existence must be subject to the influence of time. — *resurrectione* (-em A) is the correct reading (cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 29₁), as Tert. in this context prefers the ablat., even in such cases as *ad ux.* 1, 1: *nulla restitutio nuptiarum in die (A Rig.) resurrectionis repromittitur* and *adv. Marc.* 4, 31 (526, 21/2): *in resurrectione eam repromittens*. — *discesserunt* may be retained, cf. 31, 2. According to Löfstedt (*Per.*, 273/4), in Africa *discedere* was preferred to *decedere* (but Christian epitaphs found in this province are not favourable to this thesis; see *Thes.* 1. L. V, 1: 1283, 61/2).

6. *sperabuntur* = *expectabuntur*, cf. 35, 5. — *pueritiae delegata*:

'*pueritiae addicta*' Thes. l. L. V, 1: 431, 74; 'εἰς παῖδας ἀφωρισμένη' Iunius. No other instances of this use of *delegare* (and of some other peculiar expressions occurring in this highly rhetorical passage) are known. — *iuventae*: this conjecture by Rigaltius (*iuenta* A B Gel) is necessary on account of parallelism (*pueritiae*, *senectae*). A *dativus finalis* after *excitare* is found in one other passage only, viz. Colum. 10, 109: *excitet ut Veneri tardos eruca maritos*. — *senectae ponderata*: 'τῷ γῆρα σταδμιζομένη' Iunius; the interpretation of La Cerda 'ad *senectae* lancem apposita' is absurd. Note the shading of the expressions: the 'neutral' (or rather 'passive') *delegata* ∼ *pueritia*, the 'energetic' *excitata* ∼ *iuenta*, and the 'weighty' *ponderata* ∼ *senecta*. — According to Pamelius, five ages are mentioned, *virilitas* being suppressed; Iunius thinks that Tert. means two different *iuventae*, and that the older *iuenta* is identical with *virilitas*. It seems that Pamelius is right, and that Tert. was forced by the parallelism of the sentences to mention the *iuenta* twice (the second time only as a 'starting-point'). A division of life into five ages was usual among the Romans, cf. e. g. Serv. in *Aen.* 5, 295: *aetates omnes Varro sic dividit: infantiam pueritiam adolescentiam iuventam senectam*; Censorin. *de die nat.* 14, 2 (according to Varro, every *aetas* comprised fifteen years); Non. Marcell. 3, 842 Lindsay. Among Christians this division is rarely found; I can only adduce Iren. 2, 36, 2 (where he discusses the symbolic sense of the number five!) and Clem. Alex. *protr.* 10, 108, 2/3; among the Greeks, too, it is not the most usual one, cf. F. Boll, *Neue Jahrb.* 31 (1913), 89 *seqq.*; G. Höhn, *Die Einteilungsarten der Lebens- und Weltalter bei Griechen und Römern (Gymnasialprogramm, Lohr, 1911/2)*. On the other hand, a division into six ages is very common in Christian literature (it plays an important part in Augustine's historical speculations, cf. *de Genesi* c. *Manich.* 1, 23, 35 *seqq.*; *civ. dei* 22, 30; *trin.* 4, 4, 7; *de vera relig.* 26, 48), e. g. Caesar. Arelat. *serm.* 169, 1 Morin (*infantia, pueritia, adulescentia, iuventus, senectus, illa permatura, quae etiam decrepita dicitur*); different divisions are found in Victorin. Pectav. *de fabr. mundi* 9 (8, 19/21 Haussleiter) (*nativitas, inf., puer., adul., iuv., perfecta aetas, occasus*); Hier. *tract. de Ps.* 143 (*inf., puer., adul., iuv., vir, "hoc est aetatis perfectae", (aetatis) mediae, senex*); in *Gal.* 4, 15/6. Tert. himself (v. v. 1) in the development of divine justice distinguishes *rudimenta, infantia, iuventus*, and *maturitas*. — *censeat*: Oehler agrees with La Cerda's interpretation: "censura i. e. iudicio et prudentia uti". In Thes. l. L. III: 788, 1/3 this passage is put under the heading "de actione eius qui ipse se aestimat vel aliquid in censum dat". The latter interpretation seems to be the right one on account of the contrast to *militet*: here Tert. means a *pater familias*.

7. *Vita sine vita?*: cf. the words of Caecilius in Min. Fel. 11, 7: *vellem tamen sciscitari utrumne cum corporibus et corporibus quibus, ipsisme an innovatis resurgatur. sine corpore? hoc, quod sciam, neque mens neque anima nec vita est*, and Aug. *trin.* 10, 7, 9: *quia vita carere vita non potest. vacua . . . adimplenda*: time obtains its 'contents' by the

events, cf. *apol.* 26, 1: *qui . . . saeculum corpus temporum fecit.* — *impleri*: Reifferscheid's conjecture *implere* is wrong, as is shown by *impleri sustinentur* (§ 4). — *ubi . . . illorum*: on the other hand, in ch. 58 Tert. emphasizes the importance of the soul's stay in the underworld during the interim preceding the Last Judgment. — *eum* (B) is to be written on account of *usque*, *quo* following (*usquequo* is a vulgar word (Hofm., *Synt.*, 769) which is never used by Tert.; cf. *apol.* 37, 3 *ad mortem usque* and Hellmuth, 121); Tert. is not consistent in the use of *dies* as a masculine or a feminine subst.; concerning the Last Judgment, he puts (33, 11) *in eum diem quem solus pater novit* as well as *in illa die Christianae exultationis* (*cult. fem.* 2, 7, 3) and *novissima die* (*res.* 34 = 75, 11). — *quo perfectum illud repromittitur* contains an allusion to Eph. 4, 13: μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητά τῆς πίστεως . . . εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *perfectum* must have the sense here of *perfectio*, *status viri perfecti*; from the context it follows that this refers to the age, as at the resurrection the soul loses the age it had at the moment of death. Hence it is certain that Tert. was acquainted with the interpretation of τέλειος in this passage as 'full-grown' (Hier. c. *Ioann. Hieros.* 32: *miraris, si de infantibus et senibus in perfecti viri aetatem resurrectio fiat?*; Aug. *civ. dei* 22, 15: *aut si hoc de resurrectione corporum dictum est, sic accipiamus dictum, ut nec ultra nec infra iuvenilem formam resurgant corpora mortuorum, sed in eius aetate et robore, usque ad quam Christum hic pervenisse cognovimus* and *serm.* 242 (*serm. in dieb. Paschal.* 13), 4; *expos. fidei* (Caspari, *Kirchenhistor. Anecd.*, 286); *Apoc. Joh.*, p. 78 Tischendorf). This interpretation is regarded as the correct one by Lietzmann, *ad 1 Cor.* 3, 2 (*Hdb. N. T.* 9, p. 15) and 14, 20 (p. 73); cf. P. Ewald's note on Eph. 4, 13; for passages from pagan authors, see H. Bolkestein, Τέλος ὁ γάμος (Kon. Akad. v. Wet., *Afd. Letterkunde*, 76, Serie B, No. 2, Amsterdam 1933), 14₂, e. g. Xen. *Cyrop.* 1, 2, 4: παῖδες . . . ἔφηβοι . . . τέλειοι ἄνδρες. However, the choice of the adjective used as a substantive forces us to suppose that Tert. also knows the explanation of τέλειος as 'perfect' (defended by Dibelius, *Hdb. N. T.* 12, p. 62) which, according to him, may have included the *perfecta aetas*; this is also to be inferred from the words *ad angelicae plenitudinis mensuram temperatum* which only refer to perfection in general. It seems probable that Tert. quotes from memory and confuses the latter part of Eph. 4, 13 and Matth. 22, 30 (used in 37, 4: *tunc enim nuptiae non erunt*): ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν (*par. Luc.* 20, 35).

8. *extorres inferum habebuntur*: Weil, *Ét.*, 88₁, followed by d'Alès, *Théol.*, 132₁, approves of the conjecture of Ursinus: *nec extorres i. h.* He fails to see that after *habebuntur* we are not to supply *a me*, but *a vulgo*, *ab hominibus imperitis*, as is proved by what follows: *quas vi ereptas arbitrantur*. In exactly the same way, the discussion on the ἄταφοι is introduced by *creditum est* (§ 2), that on the ἄωποι by *aiunt* (§ 4). — *praecipue per atrocitates*: it seems im-

possible to retain the reading of A: *praecipua atrocitate* (though *praecipuus* sometimes occurs in Tert.'s writings of this period, e. g. *adv. Marc.* 1, 17 (312, 2) and 2, 7 = 343, 12). It is hardly probable that Tert. dared to pretend that only those who had been executed were regarded as βαιοθάνατοι; on the contrary, it is easy to understand that he represented the only subsection he wanted to discuss as the most important one. As to the punishments after death of executed criminals, cf. also [Apul.] *Asclep.* 29 (67, 7 *seqq.* Thom.). *atrocitas* is used very often by Tert., particularly in connection with persecutions, e. g. *apol.* 46, 16: *pro suis* (sc. Christianis) *omni atrocitate dissipatis*; *ib.* 50, 10; *adv. Marc.* 3, 19 (408, 26): *a. crucis*; *praescr.* 4, 15: *persecutionum a. -e*; *scorp.* 1 (145, 14). Here no word is said about persecutions, lest one should remark that the martyrs, too, are βαιοθάνατοι. — *crucis . . . feræ*: similar enumerations occur in *apol.* 49, 4; *ad nat.* 1, 3, 10; 1, 18, 1. — *nec isti . . . decernit*: this is contrary to the common view, e. g. Apul. *Asclep.* 29: *qui damnati humanis legibus vitam violenter amittunt*; Firm. Mat. *Math.* 4, 11, 4: *ut sententia iudicis ludis* (for this constitution of the text, see Wikström, 23) *deputari cogantur et fiant ex ista damnatione biothanati*. Tert.'s opinion is also found in Lact. *ira dei* 17, 6; Hier. in *Ierem.* 4, 22: *homicidas et sacrilegos et venenarios punire non est effusio sanguinis, sed legum ministerium*. Weil, 88₁, observes about this sentence: "cette observation est empruntée a Virgile ou à la source où avait puisé Virgile". It is, however, much more probable that we have to reckon here with the influence of juridical literature (note the words *legum ministerium* in the passage from Hier.; cf. e. g. Justin. *instit.* 4, 18, 5: *lex Cornelia de sicariis, quæ homicidas ultore ferro* (Tert.: *violentiae vindex*) *persequitur*) and of Rom. 13, 4 (alluded to in 33, 6: *saeculi iustitiam, quam et apostolus non frustra gladio armatam contestatur*). — *secelestæ quæque*: for *quisque* after the positive, see 2, 4. The meaning of this sentence is: "it is not so that criminals are excluded from hell, because they are βαιοθάνατοι, but βαιοθάνατοι are excluded, because they are criminals" (this identification has been made possible by the words *praecipue per atrocitates suppliciorum*), in other words: "if it is said that executed criminals were not killed by force and so are not to be regarded as βαιοθάνατοι, I reply that they are evil souls and for this reason must stay outside hell". Here again we have of course an instance of *occupatio* (see the note on 35, 5 and the preface to chapter 55, p. 557). It stands to reason that the remark of the hypothetical opponent is such that it is easy to reply to it: "so, if the βαιοθάνατοι are bad, whereas the ἄωποι are innocent, it is impossible that both groups are excluded from hell". — *inferis exulant*: an ablat. is rarely joined to this verb (Ter. *Eun.* 610; Ovid *ep. ex Ponto* 4, 9, 41; Fulgent. *Mitol.* 3, 6). — *Alterum . . . constituas*: this is very frequent in juridical arguments, e. g. Justin. *instit.* 1, 1, 2: *duorum alterum, aut . . . aut . . .*; Gai. *dig.* 35, 2, 73, 1. — *compello* with a subjunctive seems to be very rare (in Thes. l. L. this passage only is mentioned). — *animas immaturas et innuptas*: the ἄγαμοι constitute an important subsection of the ἄωποι together with the ἄτεκνοι;

neither group possesses any progeny to render them the customary honours after death. Cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, 1, 326/7; 2, 392₂ and 412; Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, 84/5 (§ 349); Roscher, *Kynanthropie*, 40/1; Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 76; O. Waser, *A R W* 16 (1913), 373; Cumont, *Afterlife*, 137. For the ἄφθοροι as a subsection of the ἄωροι, cf. my discussion in *Mnemos.* ser. III, 12 (1944), 71/2. — **interim indignas inferis iudicas**: Junius' conjecture *indignas* is necessary: if hell is 'good', we should not say that the souls of the ἄωροι are too good for it; a perfect parallel is found in 55, 2: *qui . . . non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas*. Lindner's conjecture (*inter indignas*) is less probable, as Tert. never uses *iudicare inter* in the sense of *deputare inter* (for which cf. *Thes. l. L. V*, 1: 622, 47 *seqq.*, and from Tert.'s writings: *apol.* 38, 1; *spect.* 2 (2, 7); *paen.* 6, 14; *fuga* 12, 2 = *Isai.* 53, 12), whereas he often joins two accusatives to *iudicare* (in *de an.*: 32, 9; 46, 2; 57, 12; cf. 43, 8 and 52, 1). *interim* of course refers to the time which passes *donec reliquatio compleatur aetatum* (§ 4). The error in the MS is due to haplography.

57. *It is impossible that the soul of someone who has died reappears on earth; if this seems to happen all the same, it is due to the deceit of a demon.*

"The entire doctrine of the ἄωροι and βλασφάνatoi comes from the magicians (§ 1). They presume to have the power to conjure-up the souls even of those who were buried already; but their art is nothing but a circumvention, the real nature of which is clear to us Christians only: for we know that magic is a 'second idolatry', where demons pass themselves off as dead people, just as in idolatry they represent themselves as gods (for the rest, the gods themselves are no more than dead people) (§ 2). These magicians have a special liking for the conjuring-up of ἄωροι and βλασφάνatoi, because it is a general belief that souls snatched away by an untimely or cruel death are only too glad to lend a hand in any violent and evil deeds (§ 3). In reality demons are at work here, especially those who dwelt in these ἄωροι and βλασφάνatoi during their life-time and caused their death (§ 4). The best proof of this is furnished by exorcisms: first the demon says that he is a relation of the man in whom he lodges or a gladiator, but soon he reveals his true nature (§ 5).

The same deceit is working in the second form of magic, which is believed to conjure-up the souls of people already buried. It is more impressive, because in this case a phantom is created; but for a demon this is an easy thing to perform (§ 6). Pharaoh and the Egyptians saw serpents arising from the staffs of the magi, but Moses showed that these serpents were not real; Simon and Elymas did similar tricks, but the blindness of Elymas was no trickery indeed! Nowadays the adherents of Simon also presume that they are able to raise the souls of the prophets from hell (§ 7). To a certain extent I am inclined to believe this, for their power is not slight. It was in this way that the demon who lodged in the witch of Endor, impersonated the soul

of Samuel (§§ 8/9). If, in confutation of this, the appearance of the dead in dreams is referred to, I answer that these apparitions possess no more reality than other dreams (§ 10). The story of Lazarus and the rich man suffices to prove that nobody is released from hell (§ 11). If, however, sometimes God through the mediation of Christ, the prophets or the apostles made a soul re-enter its body, this was a concrete and tangible reality by which is also demonstrated that any bodiless appearance of the dead is nothing but deceit (§ 12)".

First of all, the theory about the *ἄωροι* and *βιαιοθάνατοι* is associated by Tert. with magic, the most important function of which is said to consist in the raising of the dead. After a short description of magic (§ 3) Tert. returns to the *ἄωροι* and *βιαιοθάνατοι* (§§ 4/5), and shows that the conjuring-up of these souls is nothing but an imposture of the demons who 'conceal themselves behind them'; exorcisms have shown that this is their usual method. In § 6 Tert. at last comes to his proper subject, i. e. the conjuring-up of souls after the interment of the body. With the help of scriptural passages he shows that here demons blind 'the eye of the soul', and make us see a body which does not really exist. After confuting the assertion that apparitions of the dead in dreams are real, Tert. finds the decisive proof in the story of Lazarus and the rich man: no soul can be released from hell; the few exceptional cases mentioned in Holy Scripture concern the return of a soul to a real body, whereas magi only work with phantoms.

With the exception of § 10 where materials seem to have been borrowed from Hermippus (see the commentary), the whole chapter is based on commonplaces from apologetic literature (§§ 2/5) and scriptural texts (§§ 6/9 and 11/2), which certainly were collected by Tert. himself.

1. *ahorus* (Thes. I. L. I: 1447, 58/62) and *biaeothanatus* (*ib.* II: 1953, 32/4) occur only here as Latin words (there is no necessity to write them as Greek words, as Leopold does; cf. 31, 5). — *optimum* . . . *biaeothanatos*: the *ahori*, who are *innocuae animae* (56, 8), are 'too good for hell' and hence will prefer to wander about the earth; the *biaeothanati*, who are criminals, do not deserve to be admitted to the *inferi*, so that they are longing to enter there and loathe their stay in higher regions. Just like the *ahorus*, the *ἔταφος*, too, *utique* . . . *tardius ad inferos abstrahi malet* (56, 3). — *iam*: 'now at last', after the discussion in 56, 4/8, where Tert. made use of circumlocutions (§ 4 *immatura morte praeventas*; § 8 *vi ereptas*); see the note on 28, 2: *Samius sophista* . . . *Pythagoras*. — *Ostanes* is "Name so ziemlich für alles Magische, das noch keinen hat und möglichst viel Autorität heucheln soll" (Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 251). Cf. K. Preisendanz, art. 'Ostanes', R. E. XVIII, 1610/42; Bidez-Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, I, 167/212; the texts *ib.*, 2, 267/356 (the present passage, together with the last sentence of ch. 55, part of ch. 56, 57, 2 up to the words *paene, fallaciam*, and 57, 3, is given as frag. 13 (p. 287/8); it is not clear what all this has to do with Ostanes). — *Typhon*: according to Bidez-Cumont,

2, 288, this is the king of Egypt mentioned by Plin. *n. h.* 2, 91; cf. Kroll, *Hermes* 65 (1930), 11. — **Dardanus**: the mythical ancestor of the Trojans to whom were ascribed the introduction of the Samothracian mysteries and the invention of magic; cf. Abt, *op. cit.*, 250; Dieterich, *Neue Jahrb.*, Suppl. Bd. 16, 754; Wellmann, *R. E.* s. v. Dardanus 11 (IV 2, 2180); Abh. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1921, 4, 15_g; 1928, 7, p. 14₇; Wünsch, *A R W* 14, 319; Wessely, *Wiener Stud.* 8, 189; Bidez-Cumont, 13 (n. 20); Kroll, *Stud. röm. Lit.*, 324. According to Fulgentius, *Virg. contin.* p. 86, 2 Helm, he was the author of *dinamera* (Δυναμερά). Apul. *apol.* 90 mentions him together with Ostanes and Damigeron. Plin. *n. h.* 30, 9 relates that Democritus recovered his writings from his grave. Of the Christian authors Arnobius (1, 52), Clem. Alex. (*protr.* 2, 13), and Eusebius (*praepar. evang.* 2, 3) mention him. — **Damigeron**: Wellmann s. v., *R. E.* IV 2, 2055; Abt, *op. cit.*, 245 (where more literature is to be found). — **Nectabis** must be a corruption of *Nectanebus*; [Callisthen.] *Hist. Alex.* (p. 1 Kroll): Φασὶ τὸν Νεκτανεβῶ, τὸν τελευταῖον τῆς Αἰγύπτου βασιλέα, τῇ μαγικῇ δυνάμει πάντων περιγενέσθαι. Cf. Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 2, 101 (§ 207) and 121 (§ 244). In Fulgent. *de aetat. mundi et hom.* p. 164, 14 Helm writes *Dictanabus*. — **Berenice** is also mentioned by Proclus, in *Plat. Rempubl.* 422 (I: 255, 15 seqq. Kroll): τελεστικός (sc. γυναικας) . . . ὡς τὴν Διοτίμαν τὴν Πλάτωνος, ὡς τὴν Θεοξέναν τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς τὴν Βερενίκην, ἄλλην ταύτην μαγείας διδάσκαλον. Perhaps the belief that she was an enchantress is due to the fact that she was the daughter of king Magas of Cyrene (Βερενίκη ἡ Μάγα); see my discussion in *Mnemos.*, III ser., 12 (1944), 72/3. — **magia** occurs from Apul. downwards; it is unnecessary to read *magica* (B; this is the older word: cf. J. C. Rolfe, *A. L. L.* 10, 241).

2. **Publica . . . litteratura**: the singular *littera* (A B mg) is impossible here (for *littera* = *epistula*, see Wack., *Synt.*, 1, 97 and Bednara, 564/5). Tert. seems to be the first author who uses *litteratura* in the sense of 'literature' (in Tac. *ann.* 11, 13 *Graeca litteratura* denotes the Greek alphabet; cf. de Labriolle's note on Aug. *confess.* 2, 3, 5 in his edition with translation, Paris 1925), e. g. 46, 10: *tota saeculi litteratura*; *idol.* 15 (48, 6); *apol.* 47, 1; *test. an.* 4 (140, 4/5); *ad nat.* 1, 10, 36; 2, 2, 5; 2, 7, 10; 2, 12, 35; *spect.* 17 (19, 19. 21). *Litterae*, too, is often used, e. g. *spect.* 5 (6, 21): *de instrumentis ethncalium litterarum*; *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 2; *test. an.* 1 (134, 4; 135, 4); 5 (141, 17. 19); *cor.* 7, 15; *ad nat.* 2, 12, 37 (for more passages, see Borleffs' index); *adv. Marc.* 5, 19 (645, 6). — *iusta aetate sopitas* corresponds with ἄωροι, *proba morte disiunctas* with βιαιοθάνατοι, *prompta humatione dispunctas* with ἄταφοι. — If *sopitus* means 'deceased', it is mostly connected with an ablat., e. g. Lucr. 3, 904: *leto sopitus* and 1038: *sopitus quiete*; without an ablat. it also occurs in [Cypri.] *carm. de resurr. mort.* 113. — **disiunctas**, viz. *a corpore*; c. Chr. 10, 10: *animas . . . a carne disiunctas*. — **dispunctas**: 'finished', 'dispatched' (cf. 33, 1); Zeno Veron. 1, 16, 4: *Samuel . . . mortis iam lege dispunctus*. — **evocaturam**: see the note on 53, 6: *evocatoris animarum*. — **incolatu**: a law term (e. g.

Modestin. *dig.* 50, 1, 34), much used by Tert. (cf. Oehler's note on *apol.* 22; Hoppe, *serm. Tert.*, 75; Ph. Thielmann, A. L. L. 8, 239; Rönsch, *It.*², 90). — *magian* . . . *fallaciam*: *apol.* 23, 7: *magia aut aliqua eiusmodi fallacia*. — *solos*: *test. an.* 3 (137, 21): *qui* (sc. Christiani) *ea* (sc. daemonia) *soli* (*solis* Reifferscheid) *de corporibus exigimus*; *ib.* (138, 7/8): *licet soli illum* (sc. perditorem) *noverint Christiani*. Tert. likes to point out the special position of the Christians in this way, e. g. *ad Scap.* 1: *amicos enim diligere omnium est, inimicos autem solum Christianorum*; *apol.* 49, 1: *haec sunt quae in nobis solis praesumptiones vocantur, in philosophis et poetis summae scientiae et insignia ingenia*. — *spiritalia nequitiae*, τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας (Eph. 6, 12). — *invitoria* (Tp): see 39, 1; *expugnatoria* is ἁ. λ. — *totius erroris artificem*: cf. 1, 5. — *vastatorem* (A B) may be retained. Though in 1, 5 the words *vim istam . . . omnis erroris artificem* refer to demons, the devil may be meant here, just as in *test. an.* 3 (138, 1/4): *Satanan . . . quem nos dicimus malitiae angelum, totius erroris artificem, totius saeculi interpolatorem*. For Tert. 'the devil' and 'the demons' are perfectly equivalent conceptions; cf. § 4 *d a e m o n e s operantur* ∞ § 5 *fallaciam spiritus nequam sub personis defunctorum delitescens* (where the plural *personis defunctorum* makes it probable that the devil is meant as the *summa daemonum*) and my discussion of this question in *Vigiliae Christianae* 1 (1947), 22. — *sic etiam magiae*: here, too, the reading of A may be retained. Ursinus proposes to write *vastatricem scientiam magiae*, referring to which Kroymann (*Quaest. Tert.*, 120) rightly observes: "*Scientia autem magiae certe expugnatoria dominatione tractari non potest*". After *sic etiam magiae* we must supply *ratio nos non fugit*. At first Kroymann, too, wanted to do so, but he withdraws this interpretation: "*res ipsa ita intelligi vetat, quia nova aliqua res (cf. etiam) omnino hic non additur; de magia et hic et supra agitur*", and proposes to insert *obnitimur* after *magiae*. In opposition to this we have to remark that the use of *etiam* is explained in a satisfactory way by the antithesis to *ratio fallaciae*, and that the words *totius erroris* certainly refer to idolatry, as is clearly shown by the words *secundae . . . idololatriae*, which come immediately after *magiae*. That every human error eventually harks back to idolatry, was pointed out in the famous initial sentences of the treatise *De idololatria*; a parallel is also found in *apol.* 22, 6: *aspiratio daemonum et angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas* (in this passage cf. the words *luem mentis humanae*) *agit . . . erroribus variis, quorum iste potissimus, quo deos istos captis et circumscriptis hominum mentibus commendat*. — *secundae . . . idololatriae*, viz. because it refers to the dead; similarly, *cor.* 10, 7/9: *nam et mortuorum est ita coronari, quoniam et ipsi idola statim fiunt et habitu et cultu consecrationis, quae apud nos secunda idololatria est*; Hier. in *Ephes.*, praef.: *idololatria, et quod semper idololatriam sequitur, artium magicarum praestigiae*; *ep.* 96, 16, 3: *parentem suam* (sc. idololatriae) *artem magicam*. Cf. also the definition of the worship of the emperors as *secunda a deis religio . . . Caesarianae maiestatis* in *ad nat.* 1, 17, 2 (*apol.* 35, 5). — *in qua . . . fingunt*: see the comm. on § 5. — *quemadmodum in illa* (sc. idololatria)

deos: cf. the notes on 1, 4 and 46, 12. — **cum et dii mortui:** Christian apologetic literature had borrowed the view of Euhemerus (who is mentioned by Min. Fel. 21, 1) that the pagan gods are men who after their death were raised to the states of superhuman beings; cf. e. g. Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 1, 9: καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα ὧν φησὶ σέβεσθαι θεῶν ὀνόματά ἐστι νεκρῶν ἀνθρώπων; Athenag. *legat.* 28 *seqq.* (for this very detailed discussion, see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 223 *seqq.*); Min. Fel. 21/4; Tert. *apol.* 11/2. The greater part of the apologists connect this conception with the adoration of the images of the gods: they assume that for these deceased people statues were erected which are as dead as those whom they represent. Next they state either that these images themselves are worshipped as gods, or that demons lodge in them; for the first thought, cf. Melito Sard. *apol.* 5 (p. 425/7 Otto); *Acta Carpi* 2 (14. 15); [Aug.] *Qu. V. et N. T.*, qu. 114, 29: *sed inrationabilis vulgus aut apparentes umbras aut daemonia aut simulacra mortuorum ut deos colere coeperunt*, etc. (in this context the unworthy origin of the images of the gods is often pointed out: Tert. *apol.* 12, 1 *seqq.*; Min. Fel. 24, 6; Arnob. 6, 14; Justin. *apol.* 1, 9, 2; Athenag. *legat.* 26; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 1, 1; *ep. ad Diognet.* 2; Prud. *perist.* 10, 299). The latter conception (which is not incompatible with the former) is specially found in Athenag. (*legat.* 26) and Tert. The most important passages are: *spect.* 12 (14, 24/6): *et idololatria parentationis est species: tam haec quam illa mortuis ministrat. in mortuorum autem idolis daemonia consistunt*; *ib.* 13 (15, 19/23): *daemoniis . . . consistentibus scilicet in consecrationibus idolorum, sive mortuorum sive, ut putant, deorum. propterea igitur, quoniam utraque species idolorum condicionis unius est, dum mortui et dei unum sunt, utraque idololatria abstinemus*; *ib.* 10 (13, 4/7): *scimus nihil esse nomina mortuorum, sicut nec ipsa simulacra eorum; sed non ignoramus, qui sub istis nominibus institutis simulacris operentur et gaudeant et divinitatem mentiantur, nequam spiritus scilicet, daemones*; for more details, see Lortz, 1, 128/47; 157/62; 2, 51/2 and the note on § 5.

3. **ad . . . facere** 'contribute to', cf. 38, 1. — **extorsit:** similarly, Lucr. 6, 1224: *extorquebat enim vitam vis morbida membris*. — For the important part played by the ἄωποι and βιαιοθάνατοι in necromancy, see Hopfner, *Gr.-äg. Offenbarungszauber*, 1, §§ 250/1; 264/5; 330/1; 335/6; 349/52; 608/9; 643/4; 816/8; Abt, *Apol. des Apul.*, 129; Gruppe, 760; my article 'Biothanati' in *R A C* 1, 1168. — **ad vicem offensae:** *ad invicem* (A Bmg) cannot be right, cf. *vicem iniuriae*, *apol.* 45, 3; *adv. Marc.* 4, 16 (468, 22/3. 469, 9. 24).

4. **adviverent:** this verb occurs for the first time in Stat. *Theb.* 12, 424 (connected with a dative, as in *adv. Marc.* 4, 19 = 483, 2). The sense 'to be still alive' is also found in *cor.* 7, 65 (in later times this meaning is a very common one, cf. Kalén, 17₁ and Thes. l. l. I: 874, 1 *seqq.*). For the *variatio temporum* (*fuere . . . impegerant*), see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 80. — **nullum . . . daemonio:** this has been discussed in 39, 1. — **incursibus:** just as ἐπιβολή (e. g. Hippocr. *de morb.*

sacr. p. 593 Kühn), *incursus* and *incursio* often denote the attack of a demon, e. g. *apol.* 37, 9 (*idol.* 20 (54, 1/2): *idololatriae incursum*); *Lact. div. instit.* 2, 15, 6; 4, 27, 14; [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 14 and 17. Cf. also *res.* 58 (118, 23/4): *aut ubi incursum infesti apud Christum? ubi daemonici impetus apud spiritum sanctum ...?*

5. *Hanc quoque fallaciam*, viz. that the demons pass themselves off as *mortui*, as contrasted with the *fallacia* (mentioned in § 2) that they represent themselves as gods (cf. the continuation: *sicut et alibi deum*). Tert. here copies his own words in *apol.* 23, 4 (similarly, *Lact. div. instit.* 4, 27, 16): *iussus a quolibet christiano loqui spiritus ille tam se daemonem confitebitur, <quod> in vero est, quam alibi deum, quod in falso est.* — *sub ... delitescens*: in the writings of the apologists we often find entirely or almost identical sentences, which, however, always refer to the pagan gods (who, according to Tert., are *mortui*), whereas here the *defuncti* are souls conjured-up by necromancers. That Tert. makes use of these expressions here, is of course due to the fact that magic is a *secunda idololatria*. We restrict ourselves to quoting some instances: *apol.* 21, 31: *comperta in primis illa omni ratione, quae delitescens sub nominibus et imaginibus mortuorum quibusdam signis et miraculis et oraculis fidem divinitatis operatur*; *Min. Fel.* 27, 1: *isti igitur impuri spiritus, daemones, ut ostensum magis ... sub statu et imaginibus consecratis delitescunt* (this passage has been copied by [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 7; *Lact. div. instit.* 2, 16, 19). — *exorcismis*: Tp; for the history of this word, see H. Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache*, 100/1 (a special class of *exorcistae* is mentioned by Cypr., but not yet by Tert.). — *aliquem ... sui*: in exorcisms the demon at first passes himself off for an ἄωρος or βιαοθάνατος, but ultimately he is forced to admit defeat and to confess that in reality he is an evil spirit; in this way the fallacious doctrine about the ἄωροι and βιαοθάνατοι is confuted by the Christians. Since *gladiator* and *bestiarius* refer to apparitions of the demons as βιαοθάνατοι, it is highly probable that the words *aliquem ... sui* should be associated with their appearance as ἄωροι; so Tert. must mean a relation of the exorcised who has died young. There cannot be any doubt about the rightness of Mercerus' conjecture *hominis* (the erroneous reading of A B, *hominem*, seems to be due to the preceding *aliquem*). For *homo suus*, see the note on 35, 6; for the demon this must be the man in whom he 'lodges', whose *hospes* he is (thus e. g. *Ven. Fort. vita Mart.* 1, 430. 434; cf. *Blomgren, Fort.*, 1, 167; *Thes.* 1. L. VI, 3: 3026, 3/11); more about this conception is to be found in the note on 11, 5. Besides this, the words may also denote that the man in whom the demon dwells has become his slave; cf. e. g. *fuga* 2, 2: *ut ... homines eius (sc. diaboli) fuisse traducat* (sc. dominus), *qui defecerint ad illum.* — *affirmat*: '<falsely> assures'; see the notes on 3, 2 and 17, 2 (*adseverat*). — *gladiatorem vel bestiarium*: according to the great Paris magical papyrus (l. 1390 *seqq.*), the magician must go there όπου ἦρως ἐσφάγησαν καὶ μονομάχοι καὶ βίαιοι; for more details, cf. *Hopfner, op. cit.*, 1, 59 (§ 251) and 85 (§ 352); O. Jahn, *Ber. d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl.*,

1855, 95 *seqq.* — **excludere**: the choice of this verb in this context is of course due to the fact that *excludere* was the technical term for the exorcizing of demons (see the note on 2, 5). — **turbet**: this conjecture of Ursinus must be put into the text, unless we suppose that here, too, we have to reckon with the fact that *diabolus* and *daemones* are interchangeable conceptions. — **in vero**: cf. the note on 10, 8: *in discreto*. — **invitus confitetur**: the usual issue of exorcisms as they are described by the apologists, e. g. Min. Fel. 27, 5 *seqq.*; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 8; Lact. *div. instit.* 2, 15, 3; [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 7 (here Min. Fel. has been copied). For Tert. (who discusses this subject very often), see Waltz., *Ét.*, 267/72; the most important passage is *apol.* 23, 4/6: *Edatur hic aliqui ibidem sub tribunali vestro, quem daemone agi constet; iussus a quolibet christiano loqui spiritus ille tam se daemonem confitebitur, <quod> in vero est, quam alibi deum, quod in falso est. Aequae producaturs aliquis ex his, qui de deo pati existimantur, qui aris inhalantes numen de nidore concipiunt, qui ructuando curantur, qui anhelando praeferantur. Ista ipsa Virgo Caelestis, . . . ipse iste Aesculapius, . . . nisi se daemones confessi fuerint, Christiano mentiri non audentes, ibidem illius christiani procacissimi sanguinem fundite*; *ib.* 23, 16; 27, 6; 32, 3; 37, 9; *idol.* 11 (42, 22 *seqq.*); *cor.* 11, 17; *ad Scap.* 2; *test. an.* 3 (137, 21). In *spect.* 26 Tert. relates that a demon, who in the theatre had taken possession of a woman, on being exorcised remarked: *et iustissime quidem . . . feci; in meo eam inveni*. For Tert., cf. d'Alès, *Théol.*, 160; Heinze, *Apol.*, 401/3; Lortz, 1, 160/1; for exorcisms in general, Tamborino, 107/8 and Dölger, *ACh* 3 (1932), 162 *seqq.* The words *instantia divinae gratiae victus* refer to the *tormenta verborum* and *orationis incendia* (viz. in *exorcismo*) mentioned by Min. Fel. 27, 5; cf. also Cypr. *ad Demetr.* 15: *torquentur* (sc. *daemones*) *spiritualibus flagris et verborum tormentis* and *ep.* 69, 15; [Cypr.] *Quod idola* 7; Lact. *div. instit.* 2, 15, 3 (in these two passages Min. Fel. has been copied again); Paulin. Nol. *carm.* 14, 33.

6. in illa alia specie magiae: here the second part of the chapter begins; cf. *idol.* 9 (39, 2/3): *alia illa species magiae quae miraculis operatur*. — **operator** must be retained (-antior Oehl.) though in *adv. Marc.* 2, 4 (338, 7/8) we find: *eam quoque bonitas et quidem operantior operata est*. *Inoperatus* occurs *ib.* 2, 11 (350, 25): *nec natura enim inoperatam debuit continuisse bonitatem*. For more details, see Mnemos. III ser., 10 (1942), 234/5, where I have demonstrated that in Tac. *hist.* 3, 4, 1: *Tampius Flavianus, natura ac senecta cunctatior*, the reading of the Cod. Mediceus (*cunctator* Lipsius, *cunctantior* Halm) is right. Add *v.* 10: *quorum* (sc. *masculorum*) *quanto sexus avidior et calidior in feminas, tanto continentia maioris ardoris laboratior* (here *laboratus* has the sense of a Greek medium; see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 100₃); on the other hand, in Iul. Valer. 1, 9 (*mulier trepidatior*), where neither a deponent verb nor the sense of a Greek medium is found, Kroll's conjecture *trepidantior* (Rh. Mus. 70, 594) is necessary (cf. Fassbender, 66₂; Axelson, *Iul. Val.*, 11). — **quia . . . affingitur**: which is not the case in the conjuring-up of ἄωποι and βλαιοθάνατοι. — **nec magnum**:

from 2 Cor. 11, 15: οὐ μέγα οὖν εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ (viz. of the devil) μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης (the preceding verse is quoted in § 8); cf. c. *Chr.* 16, 27 and *adv. Marc.* 5, 14 (622, 23). Similarly, Aug. *trin.* 4, 11, 14: *quid magnum est diabolo et angelis eius, de corporeis elementis per aerea corpora facere quae caro miretur.* — *circumscribere*: 'to deceive'. This meaning (which is found from Cic. *pro Rosc. com.* 24 downwards) is particularly common in juridical literature (also in *apol.* 17, 5. 22, 6; *ad ux.* 2, 2; *-ptio pat.* 5 (7, 22); *-ptor adv. Marc.* 1, 27 (328, 7) and 2, 7 (344, 1/2): *ipsum-em colubrum* = *diabolum*). — *extiores . . . interiorem mentis aciem*: the same antithesis occurs in *adv. Marc.* 5, 17 (634, 2/3): *ille dabit 'inluminatos cordis oculos'* (Eph. 1, 18) *qui etiam extiores oculos luce ditavit*. For the conception 'the eye of the soul', cf. Kroll's note on Cic. *Orat.* 101 and Bömer, 173/4; for Philo, Josephus, and the N. T., see Dibelius' note on Eph. 1, 18 (*Hdb. N T* 12, p. 48). The earliest instances are found in Plato (*Resp.* 7, 519 B; *Phaedo* 65 E seq.; *Sympos.* 212 A (cf. Stallbaum's note); *Soph.* 254 A); it plays a particularly important part in the *Corpus Hermeticum* (Bömer; J. Kroll, *Herm.*, 352₄; W. Kroll, R. E. VIII, 816/7), Philo (Leisegang's index s. v. ὄμμα; Reitzenstein, *Hell. Myst.*, 318), Clem. Alex., Aug., and the Cappadocians.

7. *videbantur*: 'were seen'; as is shown by the preceding sentence and by § 9, Tert. only denies the reality of what the apparition was thought to represent, not the existence of a phantom and the perception of it. The same estimation is found in [Justin.] *Quaest. ad orthod.* 26 (Otto, Corp. Apologet. III, 2, p. 40): Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ Μωϋσεως γεγόμενα θαύματα, ἅτε κατὰ τὴν θείαν γεγενημένα ἐνέργειαν, κατὰ μεταβολὴν γεγένηται φύσεως . . . τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπαοιδῶν γεγόμενα κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἐγένοντο τῶν δαιμόνων, τῶν φαντασάντων τὰς ὁψεις τῶν ὁρώντων, τὸν μὴ ὄφιν ὄραν ὡς τὸν ὄφιν. Aug., who in *Quaest. in Exod.* 21 discusses this question in detail (but with great reserve), leaves the possibility that the serpents existed in reality. — *Mosei veritas* = *verus serpens a Moyse creatus*, viz. from the staff of Aaron (Exod. 7, 10; cf. Orig. c. *Cels.* 2, 50/1). — *Multa*, viz. *fecerunt*; for this ellipsis, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 46 and *Synt.*, 145. — *de*: cf. 24, 5. — *aemulatio . . . immundo*: see the note on 20, 5: *diabolus aemulus*. — *Simonis . . . spondeant*: the numerous conjectures are unnecessary. Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 4, 89 rightly observes: "zu *spondeant* ist als Subject die Simonianer zu denken; in ihnen hat sich die Einbildung von der Kunst Simons bis zu solcher Vermessenheit gesteigert". *Ars Simonis haeretici* has a very concrete meaning and is equivalent to *magi Simoniani*: "the *ars* of Simon lives on in his proselytes". A similar instance of the construction κατὰ σύνεσιν occurs in Filastr. 25, 1 (cf. Juret, *Filastr.*, 60): *alia est heresis in Iudaeis quae . . . asserunt*. For *ars* = *ars magica*, see the note on 34, 2, for the magic practices of the *Simoniani*, Iren. 1, 16, 3; Hippolyt. *refut.* 6, 7. 20; Filastr. 29, 2; H. Waitz, Z N T W 5 (1904), 123/4. For *tanta . . . se . . . extollit*, cf. e. g. Verg. *Aen.* 7, 448: *tantaque se facies aperit*.

8. *credo, quia mendacio possunt*: Hoppe (*Synt.*, 76) adduces this sentence as one of the very rare instances in Tert.'s writings of the use of *quia* with an indicative instead of an *accus. cum inf.* (apart from quotations from Holy Scripture the only other instance occurs in *idol.* 20 = 54, 16). A different translation seems more probable however: "And I do believe this indeed, because they are powerful on account of their fallacious art"; a kind of parallel is found in *c. Chr.* 5, 28: *credibile est, quia ineptum est*. This interpretation also has the advantage that the sense of *et* receives its full due. For the use of *possunt* without an object we may compare the same use of *licere* in 28, 5 (in a similar context!). One may of course oppose that Tert. does not want to imply that, according to his opinion, the magi have indeed the power to conjure-up the souls of prophets, but here Tert. refers to the perception of the phantom only: the existence of a *phantasma* is not denied by him (cf. § 6). In the next sentence, which contains the motivation of his assertion (*enim*), Tert. also means a real *effingere* and a real perception of the phantom, as is clearly shown by § 9; he only denies that the soul of Samuel was raised from hell. — *pythonico spiritui*: cf. 28, 5. — It was a much discussed question among the apologists and the Church-fathers, whether the soul of Samuel, when conjured-up by the witch of Endor (I Reg. 28, 6 *seqq.*), had appeared in reality or not. Most of the relevant passages have been collected by Leo Allatius in his monograph *De Engastrimytho* (in the *Addenda* to his edition of the treatises on this subject by Origen and Eustathius of Antiochia, Lyons 1629, 413/532). The most important details may be mentioned here. The reality of the apparition is assumed by Justin *dial. c. Tryph.* 105, 4: καὶ ὅτι μένουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀπέδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τὴν Σαμουὴλ ψυχὴν κληθῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου, ὡς ἡξίωσεν ὁ Σαούλ; Orig. *homil. in I Reg.* 28 (G C S Orig. III, p. 283/94; the most detailed discussion of the subject); Anastas. Sin., *Quaest. et respons. de var. argum.* 112 (P. G. 89, 764/5); Sulpic. Sever. *chron.* 1, 36, 1; Zeno Veron. 1, 16, 4. Most of the Church-fathers, just like Tert., suppose deceit by a demon. The following passages deserve to be quoted in full on account of their similarity to Tert.'s argument: [Hippolyt.] *Eis τὴν Ἐγγαστρίμυθον* (G C S Hippolyt. I 2, p. 123): Σαούλ οὐκ εἶδεν, ἀλλ' ἀκούσας παρὰ τῆς γυναικός, ὅπερ ἐβλέπεν, σχῆμα τῶν ἀνιόντων ἐνός καὶ ἐπιγνούς ὡς Σαμουὴλ τοιοῦτῳ ἐχρᾶτο, προσεκύνησεν. Οὐδὲν δὲ τῷ δαίμονι μορφῶσαι, ὅπερ ἡδεῖ, σχῆμα τοῦ Σαμουὴλ (cf. Tert. § 6: *nec magnum . . . perfacile est*); *Pass. Pion.* 14, 10/1: *dixit namque apostolus: 'si Satanas in angelum lucis transformatur, nihil magnum si ministri eius transfigurantur velut ministri iustitiae (the same quotation in Tert.), unde et Antichristus quasi Christus. Ideo ergo Samuel non est reductus, sed illi mulieri et praevaricatori Sauli daemones ad personam illius se ostendere formati*; besides, cf. Hier. *in Ezech.* 13, 17 *seqq.* and *in Matth.* 6, 31; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. et N. T.*, qu. 27; [Aug.] *de mirab. S. Script.* 2, 11; Filastr. 26, 1/2; [Basil.] *ad Isai.* 8, 19/22 (P. G. 30, 498 A *seqq.*); Gregor. Nyss. Π. τ. ἐγγαστρίμ. (P. G. 45, 108/14); Isidor. *Orig.* 8, 9, 7. By far the most important discussion on this side is the treatise by Eustathius

of Antiochia: Κατὰ Ὁριγένους διαγνωστικὸς εἰς τὸ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου θεώρημα (P. G. 18, 613/74; a special edition (together with the homily of Origen) has been given by Jahn, T U II, 4); the following sentence (ch. 10) may be compared to Tert.'s argument: ἐγὼ μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἐννοιαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτον εἶναι Σαμουήλ, ἅτε δὴ πολιόρκούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος ἔνδοθεν. The question is left undecided by Gregor. Nazianz., *contra Iulian.* 1, 54, and by Aug., *de div. quaest. ad Simplic.* 2, qu. 3, 1: *quolibet enim modo fecerit* (sc. *Satanas*), *ille etiam modus quo Samueli factum est ut excitaretur, similiter latet.* According to Aug., the possibility remains that all this happened in reality *aliqua dispensatione divinae voluntatis*; cf. *de cura ger. pro mort.* 15, 18; *de octo Dulcitii quaest.*, qu. 6 (this is only a repetition of the two former discussions). Hier. *de vir. illustr.* 83 tells us that Methodius was the author of a treatise '*De Pythonissa contra Origenem*'; in *de resurr.* 3, 17, 4 however, the latter says: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Σαμουήλ φαινόμενος, ὡς δῆλόν ἐστιν . . . ὁρατὸς ὧν παρίστησιν ὅτι σῶμα περιέχειτο (but this fragment, preserved by Photius *Biblioth.* 234, is identical with the *Fragmentum de resurrectione* (P. G. 11, 96) generally attributed to Origen). Eucherius, too (*instruct.* 1, *de Regum* 5 = 83, 12 *seqq.* Wotke), does not dare to make a decisive statement: *aut falsam tunc umbram videntibus diabolus ostendit, aut si fuit vera, tantum ei licuisse credendum est, quantum domino permittente concessum est.* The discussion found in [Justin] *Quaest. et respons. ad orthodox.* 52 is also worthy of mention (Otto, *Corp. Apologet.* III, 2, p. 76): τὰ δὲ ἅλλα πάντα ὑπὸ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου γεγονότα κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δαίμονος τοῦ τὰς ὕψεις φαντάσαντος τῶν ὁρώντων τὸν οὐκ ὄντα Σαμουήλ· ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια τῶν ῥημάτων γέγονεν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ δεδωκότος τῷ δαίμονι ἐν σχήματι τοῦ Σαμουήλ ὁφθῆναι. A treatise '*De Saul et Pythonissa*' by Hippolytus is mentioned in Hier. *de vir. illustr.* 61. For the rest, the conception that a demon lodged in the witch of Endor, occurs already in Joseph. *antiq. Iud.* 6, 14, 2. — *post deum* = *postquam deum consuluit*; it is not necessary to suppose here (as I did in my thesis) a pregnant use of *post*, = *postquam deum reliquit, a deo defecit.* — *satanas* . . . *lucis*: 2 Cor. 11, 14 is also quoted in this context in *Pass. Pion.* 14, 10; [Aug.] *Quaest. V. en N. T.*, qu. 27; [Aug.] *de mirab. S. Script.* 2, 11; Aug. *Quaest. ad Simplic.* 2, qu. 3, § 2. — *asseveraturus* = *falso affirmaturus*, cf. 17, 2. — *Dubitavit . . . morabatur*: if it is true that one day Satan will pass himself off as God and try 'to tempt the chosen', he will surely (*si forte* is used ironically; see the note on 8, 5) not have had the slightest difficulty in representing himself as a prophet, especially with regard to Saul, who was anything but an *electus*. In Saul he dwelt already, so that one and the same spirit 'provided for the imposture' (viz. by making a phantom and by creating the impression that this phantom spoke as Samuel, which was possible, because as a *spiritus pythonicus* he dwelt in the *pythonissa*) and 'recommended' it (viz. because he lodged in Saul as well, and so made him inclined to believe that the apparition was real). In this way it was easy for him to suggest (viz. *ex pseudoprophetide*) that which he had already made Saul believe. Note the parallelism: a) ('spiritus in

pseudoprophetide') *administrabat* — *in pseudoprophetide* — *mentiri*; b) ('spiritus in Saule') *commendabat* — *in apostata* — *fecerat credi*. It is not exactly clear what Tert. means in saying that the same spirit dwelt in the witch and in Saul. It does not seem very probable that according to him, the *spiritus pythonicus*, who lodged in the *pythoussa*, was present in Saul too, as his conception of the 'residing' of a demon in a human being is very concrete (see the note on 11,5). Perhaps we may suppose (though we must certainly reckon with the possibility that here again the formulation was more important to Tert. than the consequences of his assertion) that this 'same spirit' is Satan, whom he used to regard as the *summa daemonum* (see the note on *vastatorem* in § 2). If this interpretation is right, Tert. means to say that the devil made one of his servants dwell in Saul, another in the witch.

9. *ne* has consecutive sense again (see the note on 6,5): "so that you must not think". — *administrabat* almost = *creabat*, cf. *effingere* § 8; more about this verb in the note on 14, 4. — *et in pseudoprophetide et in apostata*, sc. *δντα* (cf. 5, 4), for the evil spirit did not lie *in apostata*, but only *in pseudoprophetide* (see the comm. on § 8). *pseudoprophetide* (B) is the correct reading; an accusative *prophetidem* occurs in *res.* 11 (39, 20) and *exh. cast.* 10, 31. — *thesaurus*: cf. 15, 4. — *Et ideo . . . credidit*: a similar argument is found in Tatian. *orat.* 19 (21, 25/22, 2 Schw.): *ὁ* (sc. *δαίμων*) *ποιῶν σε φιλάργυρον, οὗτος καὶ περὶ τοῦ πλουτεῖν σοι μαντεύεται· στάσεις καὶ μάχας ὁ ἐγείρων καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν πολέμῳ νίκης προαγορεύει*. Many instances of such a *conversio* have been collected by Thörnell, *Stud. Tert.*, 4, 138/9. The meaning of the sentence seems to be: „Saul saw (and took for Samuel) the same evil spirit who had made him believe that the apparition of Samuel was real; for he believed in the spirit, who showed him the apparition (his heart was no longer with God)". Here again the formulation seems to have been the first consideration with Tert. In seeing the phantom which represents the soul of Samuel, Saul does not see the demon; but when he hears the phantom speak and believes that he hears Samuel speaking, he in reality hears the *spiritus pythonicus* speaking from inside the witch.

10. The argument in this paragraph may be paraphrased in this way: (the imaginary opponent:) "It is certain that sometimes the souls of the dead are released from hell, as we see them appear in dreams" (of course this remark is only possible if one supposes, as was generally done in antiquity, that in dreams, particularly in prophetic dreams, we see real apparitions; cf. *non frustra*). (Tert.): "Nothing of what we see in dreams must be regarded without more as really existing; there is not the least reason to make an exception for the souls of the dead: these are perceived in dreams in exactly the same way as the quick <who do not really appear in dreams either>" What follows (*Non enim . . . renuntiatur*) does not tally with this argument, for there Tert. contends that a dream is 'true', when ful-

filled; if we understand *vera* in the same way as the preceding *vere*, viz. as 'real', dreams which are fulfilled are 'real', even if the souls of the dead appear in them; but in this case the assertion of the opponent (*saepe non frustra mortuos visos*) has not been confuted at all. It seems necessary to suppose that with *vera somnia* Tert. does not mean 'real apparitions' but only 'dreams which tell the truth' and has inserted the impressive antithesis *de effectu . . . de conspectu* into a context in which it is out of place. For the third time the formulation has been more important than the thought underlying it. — *nocturnis imaginibus*: a very common designation of dreams from Tibull. 3, 4, 56 downwards. — *saepe . . . visos*: the reading of A (*vivos*), which is completely absurd here, is certainly due to the repeated use of *vivos* in this passage. That *visos* must be right, is shown by *omnia quae videntur* and by *de conspectu* at the end of the paragraph: the appearance in dreams in itself is of no great account. — *Nasamonas*, etc.: this passage has certainly been taken from the same source as the materials used in chapter 46 (a quotation from Herodotus again). Hdt. 4, 172 (cf. Mela 1, 8, 43): *μαντεύονται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων φοιτέοντες τὰ σήματα, καὶ κατευξάμενοι ἐπικατακοιμῶνται· τὸ δ' ἂν ἴδῃ ἐν τῇ ὄψι ἐνύπνιον, τοῦτω χράται.* — *Heraclides . . . vel Nymphodorus vel Herodotus*: according to Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 119, this passage may perhaps be adduced as an instance of the use of *vel* = *et*; it seems more probable that we must compare it with 46, 5: *Aristodemus vel Aristophon*: "Heraclides — or Nymphodorus or Herodotus, no matter which": Tert. leaves to the reader the choice between these authors, who are completely indifferent to him. *Heraclides* seems to be Heraclides Lembus, who lived at the court of Ptolemaeus VI (Susemihl, 1, 501 *seqq.*). The note on the Nasamonas was probably to be found in his excerpts from the *Πολιτικοί* of Aristotle, perhaps in the *Νόμιμα βαρβάρικα*. — *Nymphodorus* of Syracuse probably lived at the beginning of the Alexandrine period. His work *Νόμιμα βαρβάρικα* (in at least 13 books) is mentioned by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1, 21, 106, 6; cf. Susemihl, 1, 475 *seq.*; R. Laqueur, *R. E.* XVII, 1623/5. The present passage has been overlooked by Müller (*Fragm. Hist. Graec.*, 2, 375 *seqq.*). — *Celtas*: Nicander may have discussed the subject in his *Εὐρωπ(ε)ία* (Athen. 7, 296 F) or in the three books *Περὶ πάντων χρηστηρίων* (Suidas s. v.). — *patimur* almost = *sentimus*, cf. 12, 4: *et sentire enim pati est*.

11. Just like Tert., Eustathius *de engastrim.* 14 regards the story of Lazarus as a proof ὡς ὁ Σαουλ . . . οὐκ ἔστι μετὰ τοῦ προφήτου Σαμουὴλ. The double *accus. c. inf.* may be explained in the most natural way, if we suppose that *ex persona Abrahae* has the sense of *ex voce Abrahae* (for *ex persona*, see the note on 17, 12); indeed Tert. mentions things which in Luc. 16, 26. 29 are uttered by Abraham. On the other hand, it is not altogether out of the question that *sanxit* is to be connected with both *accus. c. inf.*, as in Quint. *declam.* 45, 28 *seqq.* Ritter: *quippe etiam hi qui recipiendos esse transfugas, hoc dicunt, in superiore esse loco nostram civitatem* (cf. Wahlén, 80, and

Baehrens, *Beitr.*, 275). We may also compare [Caes.] *bell. Hispan.* 9, 1 where an *accus. c. inf.* ("wozu zeugmatisch ein *putabat* zu ergänzen ist", Klotz, *Komm. z. bell. Hispan.*, 60; cf. Kurfess, *B Ph W* 44 (1924), 1310) as well as the accusative *loci difficultatem* depends on *animadvertet*; in the same way, we may supply *dicens* after *sanzit*. — **argumento**: this word is used in the same context in *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (536, 11). From this passage Harnack draws the conclusion that the Gospel of Marcion contained headings of the separate chapters (*Marcion*, 170*); but then in this passage, too (which is overlooked by Harnack), *argumentum* must mean 'heading', which is highly improbable. — **non . . . infernae** refers to the words of Abraham in *Luc.* 16, 26: Καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις μεταξύ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν χάσμα μέγα ἐστήρικται, ὅπως οἱ θέλοντες διαβῆναι ἐνθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς μὴ δύνωνται, μηδὲ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν. — **renuntiatorem** (Tp according to Cooper, 65, but not mentioned by Hoppe, *Beitr.*) also occurs in *de pall.* 4, 10; perhaps the word is a technical term of lawyers (e.g. *Paul. dig.* 48, 19, 38, 1). — **ut Moysi . . . crederetur**: cf. *Luc.* 16, 29: λέγει δὲ Ἀβραάμ· ἔχουσι Μωϋσέα καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας· ἀκουσάτωσαν αὐτῶν. If somebody should have returned from hell at that time possessing the knowledge which the rich man now possessed, Moses and the prophets would certainly have found credence.

12. Just like Tert., Eustath. 16 says: θεῶ γὰρ ὑπάρχει μόνῳ τοιαύτη ἐξουσία ἐπιτάσσειν, ὥστε ψυχὰς ἐξ ᾗδου μεταπέμπεσθαι καὶ καλεῖν; cf. *ib.* 23 and 30. For *revocavit* (sc. *in vitam*), see the note on 35, 1. — **licentiae poetarum**: cf. Otto, *Sprichw.*, s. v. *poeta* 1) (p. 283) with the additions by Weyman, *A. L. L.* 8, 35. 408. From Tert.'s writings cf. *adv. Marc.* 1, 3 (293, 14/5): *poëtica et pictoria licentia*; *ad nat.* 2, 7, 9; *apol.* 12, 2; see also the note on 56, 2: *poeticae iura*. — **repraesentat**: the various significations of this word in Tert.'s works have been fully discussed by d'Alès, *Théol.*, 356/8 (the concrete meaning found here occurs sixteen times). — **solida**: 'solid', 'concrete', often with the secondary meaning 'complete', e.g. *mon.* 3: *totam et solidam virginitatem*; *res.* 36 (78, 26/7): *solidam resurrectionem*; *exh. cast.* 2, 8; *adv. Marc.* 1, 24 (324, 17); 3, 9 (390, 26); 4, 18 (480, 16). — **contractabili**: Tp (*Thes.* s. v., not in Hoppe, *Beitr.*), afterwards only in Christian authors; the adverb *contractabiliter* occurs in *Lucr.* 4, 660; for *satiata*, see the note on 46, 11, for *exhibitio* (a law term), Kok, 139.

58. *The punishment and reward of the souls during the interim in hell.*

"We arrive at the conclusion that after death every soul enters hell, where it is already punished or remunerated, as is shown by the story of Lazarus. Some details referring to this question which I had delayed till now, I shall discuss here at the end of my work (§ 1). — Against this view the objection is raised that the verdict to be given at the Last Judgment must not be anticipated, and that the resurrection of the body must be awaited, it having done everything together with the soul (§ 2). But it is inconceivable that the soul

which in life never rests, not even during sleep, is idle during the whole time of the interim; moreover, a complete rest in hell would be unjust, as in this case the bad would still be unpunished and the good not yet rewarded. Hence it is necessary that already during this interim the life of everybody should be investigated (§ 3). As to the second argument, we all know that the soul often feels joy or sorrow independently of the body (§ 4). It even not infrequently rejoices in the sufferings of the body, as is shown by many instances from history; but if this is true, it may also rejoice or suffer in hell without the body (§ 5). Moreover, body and soul do not always co-operate: Holy Scripture frequently takes our thoughts into account only. If so, the soul by itself will receive the retribution for everything without the body (§ 6). Besides, it always takes the lead in whatever it does in conjunction with the body: hence it must receive a retribution before the body does (§ 7). Furthermore, if by the gaol mentioned in Matth. 5, 25/6 we understand hell, and interpret 'the payment of the uttermost farthing' as the penalty for even the slightest transgression, which penalty consists in a postponement of the <first> resurrection, there cannot be any doubt that already during the interim the soul receives the retribution for its deeds, without prejudice to the second resurrection which also extends to the flesh. This was announced clearly enough by the Paraclete to those who deign to listen to him (§ 8). — Having thus discussed all existing views about the soul I have satisfied a becoming and rightful curiosity (§ 9)''.

For the contents of this chapter many parallels may be brought forward from other writings of Tert., especially from the treatises *Ad martyras* and *De resurrectione mortuorum*. It contains nothing which is not to be regarded as of his own finding.

1. *Velis ac nolis*: cf. *apol.* 24, 10: *velimus ac nolimus* (P; ac om. F; see Waltzing, *Ét.*, 277). The asyndeton *velim nolim* (from Cic. *nat. deor.* 1, 17 downwards) is more common, cf. Waltz., *loc. cit.*; Hofm., *Umgangsspr.*, 109; Kroll, *Glotta* 7 (1915), 137₁ and *Synt.*, 59. — *quia . . . partem* refers to 7, 3: *per quod enim punitur aut fovetur, hoc erit corpus* (= corporale); *reddam de isto plenius et oportunius* (to point out the connection between the two passages, *reddam* and *oportunius* are repeated here; see the note on 25, 1). — *ad hanc partem* not 'to this part of my work', but = '*ad hanc speciem*', as in 48, 4; for the ellipsis of *pertinens*, see the note on 10, 9. *oportune* refers to *in clausula*: a discussion of the fate of the soul after death has its natural place in the last chapter of the work; similarly, 42, 1: *De morte iam superest, ut illic materia ponat, ubi ipsa anima consummat*.

2. *et puniri et foveri* has been repeated again from 7, 3. — *usurpatione*: see for this law term Heumann-Seckel s. v. (3), p. 605. — *candida* = *expectatione, spe*, cf. *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (537, 26): *futuri imago ac candida quaedam utriusque iudicii*. For this word, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 119; Teeuwen, 97/100; d'Alès, *Rev. scienc. relig.* 6 (1912), 598. *praelibatione*: Tp (*praelibare* e. g. *res.* 2 = 26, 8); *operarum* = *operum*,

cf. 10, 8. — *consortis . . . mercedum*: this is pointed out continually in *de resurr.*, e. g. 15 (44, 7 *seqq.*): *age iam scindant adversarii nostri carnis animaeque contextum prius in vitae administratione, ut ita audeant scindere illud etiam in vitae remuneratione. negant operarum societatem, ut merito possint etiam mercedum negare*; *ib.* 8 (37, 4/5); 33 (73, 8); 56 (115, 15/7); cf. also *adv. Marc.* 5, 11 (615, 3/8) and 12 (617, 10/2). In *apol.* 48, 4 Tert. even says that the soul cannot undergo anything without the body: *ideoque repraesentabuntur et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine materia stabili, id est carne*; similarly, *test. an.* 4 (138, 16/7; we are not to lose sight of the fact that Tert., when he wrote the two last-mentioned treatises, had not yet constructed his theory on the corporeality of the soul). The argument which occurs in *res.* 17 (47, 19 *seqq.*) is very similar to the contents of this chapter: „Perhaps it will be believed that the body too must rise again, since the soul, as it is incorporeal, cannot obtain in any other way the retribution for its deeds (this is the view which has been defended in *apol.* and *test. an.*)”; *nos autem animam corporalem et hic profiteamur et in suo volumine probamus* (Schanz Kroym. *probavimus*, which is certainly wrong; cf. my discussion of this passage, *Mnem. III ser.*, 3 (1936), 168), *habentem proprium genus soliditatis, per quam quid et sentire et pati possit. nam et nunc animas torqueri foeverique penes inferos, licet nudas, licet adhuc exules carnis, probabit Lazari exemplum*. To this one may object: “if so, the resurrection of the flesh is not necessary”; against this Tert. puts forward: “it is necessary that the soul undergoes something together with the flesh”: *quantum enim ad agendum de suo sufficit (sc. anima), tantum et ad patiendum. ad agendum autem minus de suo sufficit. habet enim de suo solummodo cogitare velle cupere disponere, ad perficiendum autem operam carnis expectat. sic itaque et ad patiendum societatem carnis expostulat, ut tam plene per eam pati possit quam sine ea plene agere non potuit* (here more stress is laid, as is required by the context, upon those actions which are done by the soul in conjunction with the body) *et ideo in quae de suo sufficit, eorum interim sententiam pendit, concupiscentiae et cogitatus et voluntatis* (cf. § 6 in this chapter). As to the other actions, the soul awaits the resurrection of the flesh, *ut per illam etiam facta compenset, cui cogitata mandavit* (cf. § 7).

3. *At enim . . . dormiunt*: 43, 12 and 45, 1/2; *corporum enim est somnus*: 43, 5; *speculo*: 42, 3; *sequestratur*: cf. 14, 5; *delibari* according to *Thes. l. L. V*, 1: 441, 56 *seqq.*, has the sense of *deminui* here; I prefer to paraphrase the word by *praeveniri*, cf. § 2: *sine ulla praelibatione sententiae*. — *incipi*: similarly, *res.* 17 (48, 22/3): (*anima*) *prior degustans iudicium, sicut prior induxit admissum*; cf. *praecerpit*, 7, 4 and *Novat. trin.* 1: *locus enim est, quo piorum animae impiorumque ducuntur, futuri iudicii praeiudicia sentientes*. — *otium* (A) is certainly the correct reading, as is shown by *dormiemus*. In Judaic literature the condition of the dead in the graves is very often represented as a sleep (see Lietzmann’s note on 2 Cor. 5, 1 = *Hdb. N. T.* 9, p. 119); but it seems hardly probable that Tert. refers to this view here. We

may also think of those Arabian heretics mentioned by Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 6, 37, οἱ ἔλεγον τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν τέως μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καιρὸν ἄμα τῇ τελευτῇ συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασιν καὶ συνδιαφθεῖρεσθαι, αὐθις δὲ ποτε κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καιρὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀναβιώσεσθαι (Origen made them realize their error). — The words *confusa spe* and *incerta expectatione* are clearly on a level, so that it would be absurd to destroy this parallelism by reading *confusam spem* (Oehl. Reiff.). We must connect *ludentem* with *mortem*, and put a comma after *post*; cf. 43, 1: *De somno prius dispulemus, post, mortem qualiter anima decurrat. mors* has the sense of 'the time after death', cf. 42, 3: *a nobis ut de postuma vita . . . ita de morte tractabitur*; 55, 1: *triduum mortis*; 55, 5: *differentiam ethnici et fidelis in morte*.

4. With §§ 4/5 we may compare Lucr. 3, 106/9: *saepe itaque in promptu corpus quod cernitur aegret, cum tamen ex alia laetamur parte latenti: et retro fit uti contra sit saepe vicissim, cum miser ex animo laetatur corpore toto* (here this fact is put forward as an argument for the assertion that the mind is in the same position as the parts of the body, which are also independent of each other (see Heinze's note); it is not impossible that Tert. has thought of this passage here). — For *de suo*, cf. 14, 1, for *titulum* 2, 5, for *tunc* used as an adjective, 1, 2.

5. *Mentior, si*: cf. 19, 7. — Mucius Scaevola is often mentioned by the apologists (e. g. *test. an.* 4 (140, 1/3); *ad nat.* 1, 18, 3/4; Min. Fel. 37, 3; *Lact. div. inst.* 5, 13, 13; *Aug. civ. dei* 4, 20 and 5, 18). In *apol.* 50, 5 and *ad mart.* 4 the name also occurs in an enumeration of pagans who scorned death. — *solvit*: similarly, *ad nat.* 2, 10, 5: *ignis qui solvit et ipsius Herculis corpus*. — *Zeno*: his execution ordered by Dionysius is also mentioned in *apol.* 50, 9. The Sceptics regarded the cruel death of Pythagoras, Anaxarchus, Zeno, and Socrates as an argument against the existence of providence (cf. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 229 and Wendland, *Philos. Schrift üb. d. Vorsehung*, 48). As far as I know, the only other Christian authors who mention Zeno's execution are Nemesius (*de nat. hom.* 30), Clem. Alex., and Boëthius (*consol. philos.* 1, 3, 9). Nemesius also names Dionysius in this context; however, mostly we find the name of Nearchus (Val. Max. 3, 3 ext. 3; *Diod. Sicul.* 10, 18, 2; *Diog. Laërt.* 10, 26; *Philostr. Vit. Apollon.* 7, 2; *Plut. de garrul.* 8 (505 D); *Suidas s. v.*; *Diog. Laërt.* and *Suid.* also mention Diomedon, Val. Max. § 2, Phalaris) or Demyllus (*Plut. de Stoic. repugn.* 37 (1051 C) and *adv. Colot.* 32 (1126 D); both names are mentioned by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 4, 56, 1). — *ornamenta* is repeated from the similar passage occurring in *ad mart.* 4: *ornamentum enim et gloria deputabitur maiore quidem titulo, si anima potius cesserit plagis quam corpus*. — in *Cyros*: Xen. *Anabas.* 1, 9, 6. — *Adeo*: again = *ideo*, cf. 1, 4. For the whole passage we may compare *ad mart.* 5: *certe ad feras ipsas affectatione descendunt, et de morsibus et de cicatricibus formosiores sibi videntur*.

6. After showing in §§ 4/5 that the soul may feel sorrow and joy without the co-operation of the body, Tert. proceeds to the discussion of actions and asserts a) that the soul performs many actions by itself (Holy Scripture considers sins committed in thought only as equivalent to evil deeds) (§ 6); b) that to all actions done in conjunction with the body the soul gives the impulse, and hence deserves to receive the retribution for them before the body (§ 7). — **omnia opera optima**: *optima* spoils the context. Hoppe (who in *Beitr.*, 83, in giving this paraphrase: “die Seele teilt nicht alle Werke mit dem dienenden Leibe”, overlooks the fact that the main stress is laid on *opera*) is hardly right in writing: “Wenn es (viz. *optima*) echt ist, haben wir es mit einem der bei Tert. nicht ganz seltenen Fälle zu tun, wo er nicht an das unmittelbar, sondern etwas später Folgende denkt, hier an den Satz . . . sic et ob cogitatus pios et benivolos, quibus carne non eguit, sine carne recreabitur”. In the next sentence Tert. discusses sinful thoughts punished by God; it is impossible that these two sentences are connected by *nam*. At first sight, Hoppe’s interpretation is supported by the circumstance that, just as in §§ 4/5 the beginning and the end refer to each other (*ut doleat aut gaudeat? . . . adeo novit . . . gaudet*), here *omnia opera optima* is in keeping with *sic et . . . recreabitur*; but the conclusion of this part is formed by the two last sentences (*Ergo . . . recreabitur*), and in the last sentence *et* refers to *quod non sociata carne commisit*. So it seems unavoidable to delete *optima*; the error may be due to dittography. — **patitur** (A B) cannot be retained; it is true that in Tert.’s works *pati* and *perpeti* often have a very ‘active’ meaning (e. g. v. v. 1: *proprium iam negotium passus meae opinionis* = ἰδίου ἡδὴ πράγμα πεπονθὼς τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης, Hoppe, *serm. Tert.* 13, cf. however, also Brandt, 99₂), but the original meaning is still perceptible always; in 47, 3, *res suas perpeti* refers to the *ecstasis* which constitutes the essence of dreams and is a completely passive condition, whereas in the present passage a totally active sense is required. Moreover, the reading *partitur* gives a better clausula (1¹γ). — **nam . . . persequitur**: by this *persecutio* God shows that He regards the *cogitatus* and *voluntates* as actions, so that they may be called *opera animae*; so we may draw the conclusion that there are actions of the soul which are performed without the co-operation of the body. — **Qui . . . corde**: cf. 15, 4; *censura divina*: see the note on 33, 2: *humana censura*. — The superlat. *congruentissimus* is used for the first time by Apul.; it also occurs in *res.* 14 (43, 13) and *pud.* 9 (236, 25). — **non . . . carne** is repeated in *res.* 17 (48, 23/4). — **propter haec . . . quod . . . commisit**: *quod* is regarded as a relative pronoun by Thörnell (*Stud. Tert.*, 4, 126), who adduces this passage in his discussion of *apol.* 42, 7: *quae tamen apud illos coetus venduntur; quod ego si desideravero*, etc. (here, however, it is not certain whether *quod* refers to *quae* or to the entire preceding sentence, as is also pointed out by Thörnell himself) together with *spect.* 22 (23, 7): *immo quanta confessio est mala e re! quae a r u m auctores . . . sine nota non sunt*, and *res.* 50 (104, 3 seqq.): *adhuc dicam: „caro et sanguis regnum dei hereditati possidere non*

possunt”. *merito sola et per se met ipsa, ut ostenderet adhuc spiritum illi necessarium* (but here *illi* may also refer to *regnum dei*). Many instances of this construction κατὰ σύνεσιν are to be found in Löfst., *Per.*, 307/10; cf. also *Synt.*, 1, 7/8; Hofm., *Synt.*, 632; Kühn.-Stegm., 1, 62; S. Reiter, *B Ph W* 39 (1919), 671; Ch. Müller, 16; Blomgren, *Fort.*, 1, 116; Svonn., *Eran.* 32 (1934), 28; Bonnet, 501; Baehrens, *Beitr.*, 491/6; Klotz’s note on *bell. Hispan.* 22, 7 (p. 82); also *Tert. adv. Prax.* 9 (240, 11/2): *utique enim omnia quod vocantur, hoc erunt; carm. de provid. div.* 921: *hoc etiam quae facta manu speciosa fuerunt; Victorin. Pictav. in Apoc.* 11, 6: *evangelii praedicatio et indulgentia delictorum et omnia quaecumque <cum> illo advenerunt, illud* (recens. Hieron. *illa*) *dicit apparuisse*. However, it is also possible to consider *commisit* as equivalent to *peccavit* (cf. *apol.* 29, 4: *committimus in potestatem imperatorum*; already Cic. *Rosc. Amerin.* 20, 57: *cum veri simile erit aliquem commisisse*; cf. *Thes. l. L. III*: 1910, 48/73, where this passage is also registered); but on the other hand, *Tert.* never writes *propter haec* instead of *propterea*, and after *propter haec* the words *quod . . . commisit* are superfluous. — *benivolos* (A), which is the usual form in *Apul.*, may be retained (cf. *Thes. l. L. II*: 1897, 31/8; Rönsch, *It.*², 463). — *in quibus*: since A, too, has *in* (Reifferscheid’s *appar. crit.* is wrong here), the efforts of Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 83) and Hartel (*Patr. Stud.*, 4, 90) to defend *quibus* are superfluous.

7. *in carnalibus* = *in iis operibus in quibus anima carne eget*”; of course *carnalis* has no depreciatory sense here (for this sense, cf. 11, 3). — *prior* is repeated in *res.* 17 (48, 22/3): (*anima*) *prior degustans iudicium, sicut prior induxit admissum*. — *pensare*: *ib.* (48, 24/5): *ut per illam* (sc. *carnem*) *etiam facta compenset* (sc. *anima*), *cui cogitata mandavit*; here, however, according to the tendency of the treatise *de resurr.*, the importance of the flesh is more strongly emphasized (cf. the note on § 2). For the use of *pensare*, see Hartel, *Patr. Stud.*, 3, 77, for *competere*, Kok, 189/90.

8. *carcerem . . . interpretamur*: this interpretation of *Matth.* 5, 25/6 (which already occurred in 35, 3) is made clear, if we adduce *adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (419, 18 *seqq.*): *nam et confitemur in terra nobis regnum promissum, sed ante caelum, sed alio statu, utpote post resurrectionem* (viz. the ‘*resurrectio prima*’) *in mille annos in civitate divini operis Hierusalem caelo delatum . . . hanc et . . . qui apud fidem nostram est novae prophetiae sermo* (viz. *Montanism*) *testatur, ut etiam effigiem civitatis ante repraesentationem eius conspectui futuram in signum praedicarit* (for this conviction of the Montanists that soon the new Jerusalem would appear in the Phrygian city of Pepuza, see Bonwetsch, *Mont.*, 80; Labriolle, *Crise Montan.*, 89 *seqq.*). About this period of a thousand years *Tert.* says (420, 7/12): *post cuius* (sc. *regni*) *mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium, tunc, et mundi destructione et iudicii conflagratione commissa, demutati in atomo in angelicam substantiam* (viz. at the ‘*resurrectio secunda*’), *scilicet per illud incorruptelae superin-*

dumentum, transferemur in caeleste regnum. Nobody is admitted into the millennium before he has expiated his sins 'up to the last farthing'; the more sins one has to expiate, the later he will take part in the 'first resurrection'. Pagans (by *sancti* Tert. means the Christians; see the note on 39, 4) are altogether excluded from this resurrection: they remain in hell till the Last Judgment. According to Tert. and the Montanists in general, the time elapsing between death and the beginning of the millennium can only be short, as they consider the end of the world to be at hand (see d'Alès, *Théol.*, 446₁; Bonwetsch, 125); hence, though of course the expiation begins immediately after death, for most Christians the greater part of this period will fall within the thousand years of the *regnum*. Cf. the passages adduced by d'Alès, *Théol.*, 133₂, to which we must add *res.* 25 (61, 4 *seqq.*): *Etiam in Apocalypsi ordo temporum sternitur, quem martyrum quoque animae sub altari ultionem et iudicium flagitantes sustinere (= expectare) didicerunt, ut... diabolo in abyssum interim relegato primae resurrectionis praerogativa de soliis ordinetur, dehinc et igni dato universalis resurrectionis censura de libris iudicetur.* Before his conversion to Montanism Tert. was no adherent of chiliasm (cf. Waltzing's note (*comm.*, 313) on *apol.* 48, 12). The Montanists were fervent supporters of this doctrine; it was especially for the purpose of confuting them that the so-called Alogians denied the authenticity of the Apocalypse, as chiliasm was based on the interpretation of Apoc. 20, 1/6. In the Montanistic version of this doctrine the Jewish people played no part, since in it the new Jerusalem was expected to appear in Phrygia (see Bonwetsch, 79/80). For chiliasm in general, which doctrine, as is known, was upheld by Justin, Irenaeus, Melito, Commodianus, Victorinus of Pettau, Lactantius, and at first also by Augustine, and was combated for the first time by Origen, we may best consult V. Ermoni, *Les phases successives de l'erreur millénariste*, *Rev. quest. histor.* 70 (1901), 353/388; L. Gry, *Le millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement* (Paris 1904); cf. also J. Martin, *Stud. u. Beitr. zur Erklärung und Zeitbestimmung Commodians* (T U 39, 4), 133/7; J. A. Mac Culloch, Art. 'Eschatology' § 15, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* 5, 387/9; H. Leclercq, art. 'Millénarisme', *Diction. d'Archéol. Chrét. et de Liturgie* 11, 1181/95; Atzberger, *Eschatologie*, 140 *seqq.*; Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, 1⁵, 427 *seqq.*; 437/8; 614 *seqq.* The right interpretation of this passage has been given by A. J. Mason in his article *Tertullian and Purgatory* (*Journ. of Theol. Stud.* 3 (1902), 598/601). Tert. regards the circumstance that the *sancti* (*adv. Marc.* 3, 24 (420, 7/9): *... mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium*) must expiate even the slightest sins (*modicum quoque delictum*) by a residence in hell as an *argumentum a fortiori* in favour of his conviction *animam aliquid pensare penes inferos*. Nevertheless, he does not believe in a purification of the soul after death (as is also pointed out by J. Bautz, *Das Fegfeuer* (Mainz 1883), 54): he assumes that the only punishment undergone by those who, without being perfect, are not excluded from the millennium, consists in a postponement of their first resur-

rection (which, however, does not last till the Last Judgment, as Mason (p. 600) supposes, but till the moment at which they have 'paid the uttermost farthing'; it stands to reason that this moment differs for everybody); cf. Mason's conclusion: "That Tertullian may have conceived of them as undergoing some retributive, rather than purgatorial, pain in the course of this delay, is far from improbable; but there is nothing in the immediate context, or elsewhere in his works, to suggest it". On the contrary, d'Alès (*Théol.*, 133₂) asserts that Tert. believes in the existence of a purgatory: "Les élus devront expier jusqu'aux moindres fautes, avant d'être admis à la première résurrection, et leur *millennium* s'en trouvera plus ou moins écourté, si même il n'est pas, pour quelques-uns, totalement supprimé. Qu'est-ce que cette attente douloureuse, sinon un purgatoire?" It seems hardly right to denote this period of waiting as a purgatory; at all events, in the first passages where this is indubitably mentioned (*Pass. Perpet.* 7/8, cf. Dölger *ACH* 2 (1930), 1/40; for Clem. Alex. and Origen, see G. Anrich, *Clemens und Origenes als Begründer der Lehre vom Fegfeuer* (Theologische Abhandlungen, H. J. Holtzmann dargebracht (Tübingen-Leipsc 1902), 95/120); for Origen we may also compare Huet, *Origeniana*, II 2, *quaest.* 11, 10), we find descriptions which are much more concrete. — *salva resurrectionis plenitudine*: apart from the fact that the second resurrection bears upon the body too, the first resurrection extends only to the *sancti*. For *plenitudine*, cf. *res.* 25 (61, 27): *qui plenitudinem eius* (sc. resurrectionis) *agnoscimus in exitu saeculi*; *adv. Marc.* 4, 34 (537, 12/4): *donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat*. — A reference to the *paracletus* is also found at the end of the simultaneous treatises *de fuga*, *de resurr.*, and *adv. Prax.* *Si qui*: cf. *fuga* 11, 2: *si et spiritum quis agnoverit* and the note on 9, 3. For the conception 'paracletus', see N. Johansson, *Parakletoi-Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und im Urchristentum* (Lund 1940); Bauer's note on Ioh. 14, 16 (*Hdb. N. T.* 6, p. 182/3); Windisch's note on 1 Ioh. 2, 1 (*ib.* 15, p. 113). It is remarkable that Cyprian never uses *paracletus* as a designation of the Holy Spirit (Watson, 195); perhaps he considered it discredited by the Montanists. For the important part played by this conception in Tert.'s writings, see Klein, 275/6; Adam, *Kirchenbegriff Tert.'s*, 141.

9. The last sentence of the whole work points back to the beginning: *ad omne... humanam super anima opinionem... congressi* ∞ *de solo censu animae congressus Hermogeni*; for this habit of Tert., see the note on 25, 1. — *curiositati... enormi*: cf. the note on 2, 4 and *adv. Marc.* 1, 2 (292, 23): *enormitate curiositatis*. — *tantum... inquirere*: similarly, *Pass. Macchab.* 5, 21 Dörrie: *philosophiam vero lex nostra condemnat, in qua tanto minus quis intellegit, quanto plus intellegere se credit*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books or papers which I could not consult have been marked with an asterisk.

I. Referring to *De anima* only.

A. Special books and papers.

- Anon., *Tertullians Seelenlehre* (Der Katholik, 1865, 2, 195/231).
 Beck, A.: *Die Lehre des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers und Tertullians über die Entstehung der Seelen* (Philos. Jahrb. 13 (1900), 42).
 *Bouédron, *Quid senserit de natura animae Tertullianus*, thesis Rennes 1861.
 Burckhardt, F. A.: *Die Seelenlehre des Tertullianus nach dessen Tractat: de anima dargestellt*, Gymnasialprogramm Budissin 1857.
 Esser, G.: *Die Seelenlehre Tertullians*, Paderborn 1893.
 Franck, H.: *Tertullianus eo quem de anima scripsit libro quos adversarios et quibus rationibus refutaverit*, thesis Greifswald 1857.
 Hauschild, G. R.: *Tertullians Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie*, Gymnasialprogramm Frankfort a. M. 1880.
 Karpp, H.: *Sorans vier Bücher Περὶ ψυχῆς und Tertullians Schrift de anima* (Zeitschrift für d. neutest. Wiss. 33 (1934), 31/47).
 *Pagnani, P., *Il materialismo di Tertulliano* (Ann. delle univ. Toscane, Parte I, 12 (Pisa 1872), 37/56).
 Seyr, F.: *Die Seelen- und Erkenntnislehre Tertullians und die Stoa* (Commentationes Vindobonenses 3 (1937), 51/74).
 *Stoeckl, A.: *Tertulliani de anima humana doctrina*. I. II (Index lectionum aest. 1863 et hib. 1863/4), Munster i. W. 1863.

B. Passages from more extensive works.

- d'Alès, A.: *La théologie de Tertullien* (Paris 1905), 112/141.
 Bardenhewer, O.: *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*² (Freiburg i. B. 1903), 377/378.
 Esser, G.: Art. 'Tertullian' in: *Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon*², 11 (Freiburg i. B. 1899), 1424/1426.
 Freppel, C. E.: *Tertullien. Cours d'éloquence sacrée fait à la Sorbonne pendant l'année 1861/1862*³ (Paris 1887), 314/364.
 Harnack, A.: *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, 1 (Leipsic 1893), 721.
 Hauck, A.: *Tertullians Leben und Schriften* (Erlangen 1877), 282/303.
 *Hesselberg, K., *Tertullians Lehre aus seinen Schriften entwickelt* (Dorpat 1848).

Bibliography

- Krüger, G.: in: M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 3^a, (Munich 1922), 317/321.
- Monceaux, P.: *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 1 (Paris 1901), 350/352.
- Moricca, U.: *Storia della Letteratura Latina Cristiana*, 1 (Turin 1925), 274/279.
- Neander, A.: *Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullianus und Einleitung in dessen Schriften*² (Berlin 1849), 355/374.
- Noeldechen, E.: *Tertullian* (Gotha 1890), 287/320.
- Ramorino, F.: *Tertulliano* (Milan 1923), 193/206.
- Roberts, R. E.: *The Theology of Tertullian* (London 1924), 149/165.
- Teuffel, W. S.: *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 3⁶ (Leipsic—Berlin 1913), 128.
- Tixeront, J.: *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne* 1⁹ (Paris 1924), 405/407.
- *Turmel, J.: *Tertullien*² (Paris 1905).

II. Works on Tertullian.

A. Referring to the contents of his writings.

- Aalders, G. J. D.: *Tertullianus' citaten uit de Evangelien en de oud-Latijnsche Bijbelvertalingen*, thesis Amsterdam 1932.
- : *Luc. = Tertullian's quotations from St. Luke* (Mnemosyne, Ser. III, 5 (1937), 241/282).
- Adam, K.: *Hl. Geist = Die Lehre von dem Heiligen Geiste bei Hermas und Tertullian* (Theol. Quartalschr. 88 (1906), 36/61).
- : *Kirch. = Der Kirchenbegriff Tertullians. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Studie* (Forsch. z. christl. Lit.- u. Dogmengesch., VI, 4), Paderborn 1907.
- d'Alès, A.: *La traduction latine de saint Irénée* (Rev. Ét. Gr. 29 (1916), XLVIII/XLIX).
- : *Tertullien helléniste* (Rev. Ét. Gr. 50 (1937), 329/362).
- : *Tertullianea* (Rech. d. sc. relig. 25 (1935), 593/594; 26 (1936), 99/100; 366/367; 468; 27 (1937), 97/99; 228/231).
- Axelson, B.: *Prior. = Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian-Minucius Felix* (Skr. utg. av Vetensk.-Soc. i Lund, 27), Lund 1941.
- Backer, E. de: *Sacramentum. Le mot et l'idée... dans Tertullien*, Louvain 1911.
- Barth, T.: *Tertullians Auffassung des Apostels Paulus und seines Verhältnisses zu den Uraposteln* (Jahrb. f. protest. Theol. (1882), 706/756).
- Bayard, L.: *Tertullien et Cyprien*, Paris 1929.
- Beck, A.: *Römisches Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian* (Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswiss. Klasse., 7. Jahr, Heft 2), Halle 1930.
- Berton, J.: *Tertullien: le schismatique*, Paris 1928.
- Bill, A.: *Zur Erklärung und Textkritik des 1. Buches Tertullians Adversus Marcionem* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur altchristl. Lit., 38, 2), Leipsic 1911.

- Bonwetsch, N.: *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*, Bonn 1881.
- Borleffs, J. G. P.: *De Tertulliano et Minucio Felice*, thesis Groningen 1925.
- Brandt, Th.: *Tertullians Ethik*, Gütersloh 1929.
- Campanhausen, H. von: *Urchristentum und Tradition bei Tertullian* (Theol. Blätter 8 (1929), 193/200).
- Corssen, P.: *Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem in librum quartum animadversiones* (Mnemosyne, N. S. 51 (1923), 242/261; 390/411; *ib.*, 52 (1924), 225/49).
- Courdaveaux, V.: *Tertullien* (Rev. de l'hist. des relig. 23 (1891), 1/35).
- Dölger, F. J.: *ACH = Antike und Christentum. Kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1/6 (Münster i. W. 1929/1940), *passim*.
- Duchesne, L.: *Histoire ancienne de l'église*, 1^e (Paris 1911), *passim*.
- Ehrhard, A.: *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932), 247/55.
- *Fagiotto, *Tertulliano e la nuova profezia*, Rome 1924.
- Fütscher, L.: *Die natürliche Gotteserkenntnis bei Tertullian* (Ztschr. f. kath. Theol., 51 (1927), 1/34; 217/51).
- Geiselsart, N.: *Beiträge zur politischen und Kulturgeschichte aus Tertullian, Gymnasialprogramm Ravensburg* 1912.
- Ghellinck, J. de: *Pour l'histoire du mot „sacramentum“*, I, Louvain 1924.
- Glaue, P.: *Die Vorlesung heiliger Schriften bei Tertullian* (Ztschr. neutestam. Wiss. 23 (1924), 141/52).
- Guignebert, Ch.: *Tertullien. Étude sur ses sentiments à l'égard de l'empire et de la société civile*, thesis Paris 1901.
- Guilloux, P.: *L'évolution religieuse de Tertullien* (Rev. d'hist. ecclés. 19 (1923), 5/24; 141/56).
- Harnack, A. von: *Tertullian in der Literatur der alten Kirche* (Sitz. Ber. Berlin, 1895, 545/79).
- : *Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften* (*ib.*, 1914, 303/34).
- : *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*² (Texte und Untersuchungen, 45), Leipsic 1924.
- Heinze, R.: *Tertullians Apologeticum* (Sitz. Ber. Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 62 Bd., Heft 10), Leipsic 1910.
- Holl, K.: *Tertullian als Schriftsteller* (Preuss. Jahrb. 87 (1897), 262 *seqq.* = *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 3, 1 *seqq.*).
- Jeep, H.: *Tertullian als Apologet* (Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 9 (Gotha 1864), 649/87).
- Kellner, H.: *Tertullian als Historiker* (Theol. Quartalschrift 93 (1911), 319/21).
- Klap, P. A.: *Tertullianus en het Montanisme* (Theol. Studiën 15 (1897), 1/26 and 120/58).
- Koch, H.: *War Tertullian Priester?* (Hist. Jahrb. 28 (1907), 95/103).
- : *Tertullians Laienstand* (Ztschr. f. Kirchengesch. 35 (1914), 1/8).
- : *Nochmals: war Tertullian Priester?* (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 103 (1931), 108/14).
- : *Tertullian und Cyprian als religiöse Persönlichkeiten* (Internat. kirchl. Zeitschr. 10 (1920), 45/61).
- : *Tertullian und der Cölibat* (Theol. Quartalschrift 88 (1906), 406/11).

- Koch, H.: *Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienste seiner Vorgänger* (Sitz. Ber. München, Philos. hist. Abt., 1935, Heft 6), 77/82:
Zu Tertullians und Cyprians Einfluss auf Gelasius.
 —: art. 'Tertullianus', R. E. 2. R., V, 822/44.
 —: *Tertullianisches* (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 101 (1929), 458/74; 103 (1931), 95/114; 104 (1932), 127/59; 105 (1933), 39/50).
 Kotek, F.: *Anklänge an Ciceros „De natura deorum“ bei Minucius Felix und Tertullian*, Vienna 1901.
 Labriolle, P. de: *La physiologie dans l'oeuvre de Tertullien* (Arch. gén. de méd. 83 (1906), 1317/28).
 —: *Tertullien jurisconsulte* (Nouv. Rev. d'hist. de droit franç. et étr. 30 (1906), 5/27).
 —: *Tertullien était-il prêtre?* (Bull. d'anc. litt. et d'archéol. chrét. 3 (1913), 161/77).
 —: *Tertullien a-t-il connu une version latine de la Bible?* (ib. 4 (1914), 210/3).
 —: *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme* (Collectanea Friburgensia, Nouv. sér., fasc. XV), Fribourg-Paris 1913.
 —: *La crise Montaniste*, Paris 1913.
 Leblanc, J.: *Le matérialisme de Tertullien* (Annales de philosophie chrétienne, 1903, 415/24).
 Leimbach, C. L.: *Beiträge zur Abendmahlslehre Tertullians*, Gotha 1874.
 Lortz, J.: *Vernunft = Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Tertullian* (Der Katholik 93, 1 (1913), 124/40).
 —: *Apol. = Tertullian als Apologet*, 1/2, Münster i. W. 1927/8.
 Ludwig, G.: *Tertullian's Ethik*, Leipsic 1885.
 Morgan, J.: *The importance of Tertullian in the development of Christian dogma*, London 1928.
 Naumann, V.: *Das Problem des Bösen in Tertullians zweitem Buch gegen Marcion* (Ztschr. f. kathol. Theol. 58 (1934), 311/63 and 533/51).
 Nielsen, F.: *Tertullians Ethik*, thesis Copenhagen 1879.
 Quispel, G.: *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem* (thesis Utrecht), Leyden 1943.
 Rahner, K.: *Sünde als Gnadenverlust in der frühkirchlichen Literatur. IV. Tertullian* (Ztschr. f. kathol. Theol. 60 (1936), 491/507).
 Rauch, G.: *Der Einfluss der stoischen Philosophie auf die Lehrbildung Tertullians*, thesis Halle 1890.
 Rivière, J.: *Tertullien et les droits du démon* (Rev. d. scienc. relig. 6 (1926), 199/216).
 Rönsch, H.: *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, Leipsic 1871.
 Schelowsky, H.: *Der Apologet Tertullianus in seinem Verhältnis zu der griechisch-römischen Philosophie*, thesis Leipsic 1901.
 Schepelern, W.: *Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte*, Tübingen 1929.
 Scheurer, G.: *Das Auferstehungsdogma in der vornicänischen Zeit* (Würzburg 1896), 92/105.
 Schlossmann, S.: *Tertullian im Lichte der Jurisprudenz* (Ztschr. f. Kirchengesch. 27 (1906), 251/75 and 407/30).

- Schulte, F. W. C. L.: *Het heidendom bij Tertullianus* (thesis Leyden), Nijkerk 1922.
- Schulze, E. F.: *Elemente einer Theodicee bei Tertullian* (Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol. 43 (1900), 62/104).
- Schümmer, J.: *Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Tertullians* (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 27), Münster i. W. 1933.
- Schwarz, E.: *De M. Terenti Varronis apud sanctos patres vestigiis duo* (Neue Jahrb. f. klass. Philol., Suppl. 16 (1888), 405/499), 409/437.
- Seliga, St.: *De conviciis Tertullianeis* (Eos 37 (1936), 267/273).
- *Shortt, C. de L.: *The influence of philosophy on the mind of Tertullian*, 1933.
- Soden, H. von: *Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian* (Festgabe Adolf Jülicher (Tübingen 1927), 229/281).
- Stier, J.: *Die Gottes- und Logoslehre Tertullians*, Göttingen 1899.
- Tixeront, J.: *Mélanges de Patrologie* (Paris 1921), 117/152: *Tertullien moraliste*.
- *Vitton, P.: *I concetti giuridici nelle opere di Tertulliano*, Rome 1924.
- Vries, G. J. de: *Bijdrage tot de psychologie van Tertullianus*, thesis Amsterdam, 'Vrije Universiteit', Utrecht 1929.
- Waltzing, J. P.: *Pour l'étude de Tertullien* (Musée Belge 25 (1921), 7/28).
- Warfield, B. B.: *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine* (Oxford 1930), 1/109: *Tertullian and the beginnings of the doctrine of the Trinity*.
- Winkler, M.: *Der Traditionsbegriff des Urchristentums bei Tertullian* (thesis Würzburg), Munich 1897.
- Wirth, C.: *Der Verdienstbegriff bei Tertullian*, Leipsic 1892.
- Zimmermann, G.: *Die hermeneutischen Prinzipien Tertullians* (thesis Leipsic), Würzburg 1937.

B. Relating to the text of his works and his idiom.

- Åkerman, A.: *Ueber die Echtheit der letzteren Hälfte von Tertullians Adversus Iudaeos*, thesis Lund 1918.
- Blokhuis, G.: *De Latinitate qua usus est Tertullianus in Apologetico* (thesis Utrecht), Velp 1892.
- Borleffs, J. G. Ph.: *Observationes criticae ad Tertulliani Ad nationes libros* (Mnemosyne, N. S. 56 (1928), 193/201; 225/242; 57 (1929), 1/51).
- : *Observationes criticae in Tertulliani De paenitentia libellum* (Mnemosyne, N. S. 60 (1932), 41/106).
- *Condamin: *De Tertulliano christianae linguae artifice*, Lyons 1877.
- Engelbrecht, A.: *Lex. = Lexikalisches und Biblisches aus Tertullian* (Wiener Studien 27 (1905), 62/74).
- : *Neue Beitr. = Neue lexikalische und semasiologische Beiträge aus Tertullian* (Wiener Studien 28 (1906), 142/59).
- Goelzer, H.: *Le style de Tertullien* (Journal des Savants, N. S. 5 (1907), 202 seqq.).

- Gomperz, H.: *Tertulliana*, Vienna 1895.
- Hartel, W. von: *Patr. Stud.* = *Patristische Studien*, I—IV (Sitz. Ber. Wiener Akad., Philos.-hist. Classe, Bd. CXX, VI; Bd. CXXI, II. VI. XIV). Vienna 1890 (on *De anima*: IV, 48/90).
- Hauschild, G. R.: *Tert.* = *Tertullian als Wortbildner* (*Progr. Realschule* Leipsic 1876).
- : *Wortbild.* = *Die Grundsätze und Mittel der Wortbildung bei Tertullian* (*Progr. Gymnasium* Frankfort a. M. 1881).
- Hoppe, H.: *Serm. Tert.* = *De sermone Tertulliano quaestiones selectae*, thesis Marburg 1897.
- : *Synt.* = *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian*, Leipsic 1903.
- : *Tert.* = *Tertulliana* (in: *Festschrift zum 350 jährigen Jubiläum des Gymnasiums und Realgymnasiums zu Bielefeld*), 1908.
- : *Beitr.* = *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians* (Skrifter utg. av Vetensk.-soc. i Lund, 14), Lund 1932.
- Kellner, H.: *Über die sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten Tertullians* (Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift, 1876, 229/251).
- Kroymann, Aem.: *Quaestiones Tertullianae criticae*, Innsbruck 1893 (on *De anima*: 100/120).
- Langen, P.: *De usu praepositionum Tertulliano*, I, Münster i. W. 1866.
- Löfstedt, E.: *Apol.* = *Tertullians Apologeticum textkritisch untersucht*, Lund (L U Å) 1915.
- : *Krit. Apol.* = *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Tertullians Apologeticum*, Lund (L U Å) 1918.
- : *Z. Spr. Tert.* = *Zur Sprache Tertullians*, Lund (L U Å) 1920.
- Norden, E.: *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, II. *Vierter Abdruck* (Leipsic—Berlin 1923), 606/615.
- Schmidt, Aem.: *De Latinitate Tertulliana*, 1. 2, Erlangen 1870. 1872.
- : *Commentatio de nominum verbalium in tor et trix desinentium apud Tertullianum vi ac copia*, Erlangen 1878.
- Schrörs, H.: *Zur Textgeschichte und Erklärung von Tertullians Apologeticum* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur altchr. Lit. 40, 4), Leipsic 1914.
- Teeuwen, St. W. J.: *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Altert., XIV), Paderborn 1926.
- Thörnell, G.: *Lectiones Tertullianae* (*Eranos* 7 (1907), 81/103; 10 (1910), 157/160).
- : *Apol.* = *Kritiska studier till Tertullianus' Apologeticum* (*Eranos* 16 (1916), 82/160).
- : *St. Tert.* = *Studia Tertulliana*, I—IV, Uppsala (U U Å) 1918/1926.
- Vliet, J. van der: *Studia ecclesiastica. Tertullianus I. Critica et interpretatoria*, Leyden 1891 (on *De anima*: 87/92).
- Waltzing, J. P.: *La langue de Tertullien* (Musée Belge 19 (1915), 44 seq.).
- : *Ét.* = *Étude sur le Codex Fuldensis de l'Apologétique de Tertullien* (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, fasc. XXI), Liège—Paris 1914/1917.

- Waszink, J. H.: *Tertullianea* (Mnemos., III. ser., 3 (1936), 165/74; *ib.*, 9 (1940), 129/37).
 —: *Varia critica et exegetica* (*ib.*, 11 (1942), 71/4).
 Wohleb, L.: *Zu Tertullians Apologeticum* (Berlin. Philol. Woch. 36 (1916), 539 *seqq.*, etc.).

Special editions and commentaries.

Apologeticum:

- Martin, J. (Flor. Patr., fascic. VI), Bonn 1933.
 Rauschen, J.: *Emendationes et adnotationes ad Tertulliani Apologeticum* (*ib.*, fasc. XII), Bonn 1919.
 Waltzing, J. P.: *comm.* = *Tertullien Apologétique. Commentaire analytique, grammatical et historique*, Paris 1931.
 Mayor-Souter = Q. Sept. Florens *Tertullianus, Apologeticum. The text of Oehler annotated with an introduction by John E. B. Mayor. With a translation by Alex. Souter*, Cambridge 1917.

De baptismo:

- Borleffs, J. G. Ph., *Mnemosyne*, N. S. 59 (1931), 1/47.

De cultu feminarum:

- Kok, W.: *Tertullianus De cultu feminarum met inleiding, vertaling en commentaar* (thesis Amsterdam, 'Vrije Universiteit'), Dokkum 1934.

De fuga in persecutione:

- Thierry, J. J.: *Tertullianus De fuga in persecutione. Met inleiding, vertaling, toelichting en index* (thesis Amsterdam, 'Vrije Universiteit'), Hilversum 1941.

Ad nationes:

- Borleffs, J. G. Ph., Leyden 1929 (with an *index locorum similium*, pp. 86/91).
 Haidenthaller, M.: *Tertullians zweites Buch, Ad Nationes' und, De Testimonio Animae' übertragen und kommentiert* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Altert., XXIII, 1/2), Paderborn 1942.

De pallio:

- Gerlo, A.: *Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus De pallio. Kritische uitgave met vertaling en commentaar*, Wetteren 1940.

De praescriptione haereticorum, Ad Scapulam, and Ad martyras:

- Bindley, T. H.: *Tertulliani De praescriptione haereticorum, Ad martyras, Ad Scapulam with introduction and notes*, Oxford 1893.
 Martin, J.: (Flor. Patr., fasc. IV), Bonn 1930.

De spectaculis:

- Büchner, J.: *Tertullian De Spectaculis. Kommentar*, Würzburg 1935.

De testimonio animae:

Scholte, W. A. J. C.: *Q. S. Florentis Tertulliani libellum De testimonio animae praefatione, translatione, adnotationibus instructum edidit* (thesis Utrecht), Amsterdam 1934.

Complete Indices Verborum.

De anima: Waszink, J. H.: *Index verborum et locutionum quae Tertulliani De anima libro continentur. Accedunt Addenda et Corrigenda ad editionem libri eiusdem*, Bonn 1935.

Apologeticum: Henen, P.: *Index Verborum, quae Tertulliani Apologetico continentur* (Publications du Musée Belge, 5), Louvain 1910.

De baptismo: Borleffs, J. G. Ph.: *Mnemosyne*, N. S. 59 (1931), 50/102.

De fuga in persecutione: Thierry, J. J., in his edition, 233/62.

Ad nationes: Borleffs, J. G. Ph., in his edition, 92/155.

De paenitentia: Borleffs, J. G. Ph., *Mnemosyne*, N. S. 60 (1932), 274/316.

III. More general works quoted with abridged titles.

A. Works referring to the history of religion, philosophy, and medicine, and to early Christianity.

Abt, A.: *Apol.* = *Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, IV 2), Giessen 1908.

Achelis, H.: *Christ.* = *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1—2, Leipsic 1912.

Andres, F.: *Die Engellehre der griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts und ihr Verhältnis zur griechisch-römischen Dämonenlehre* (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, 12. Band, 3. Heft), Paderborn 1914.

Anrich, G.: *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, Göttingen 1894.

Arbesmann, R.: *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, XXI 1), Giessen 1929.

A R W = *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*. Freiburg i. B.—Leipsic—Tübingen 1898 *seqq.*

Atzberger, A.: *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornehmlich christlichen Zeit*, Munich 1896.

Badstübner, E.: *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik der philosophischen Schriften Senecas*, Hamburg 1901.

Bardenhewer, O.: *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg i. B. 1902 *seqq.*

Barth, C.: *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 37. Bd, 3. Heft), Leipsic 1911.

- Bauer, W.: *Rechtgl. = Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 10), Tübingen 1934.
- Bickel, E.: *Diatrise in Senecae philosophi fragmenta. I: Fragmenta de matrimonio*, Leipsic 1915.
- B K V = *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Kempten 1911 seqq.; 2nd series, Munich 1932 seqq.
- Bömer, F. *Der lateinische Neuplatonismus und Neupythagoreismus und Claudianus Mamertus in Sprache und Philosophie* (klass.-philol. Stud., herausgegeben von Ernst Bickel und Christian Jensen, Heft 7), Leipsic 1936.
- Bonhöffer, A.: *Epiktet und das Neue Testament* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, X), Giessen 1911.
- Bousset, W.: *Antichr. = Der Antichrist in der Ueberlieferung des Judenthums, des neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1895.
- : *Hauptpr. = Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1907.
- : *Kyr. = Kyrios Christos*³, Göttingen 1921.
- : *Rel. Jud. = W. Bousset und H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*³, Tübingen 1926.
- Bréhier, E.: *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*² (Études de philosophie médiévale, 8), Paris 1925.
- Clemen, C.: *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, Giessen 1909.
- Cumont, F.: *Aft. = Afterlife in Roman Paganism*, Newhaven 1922.
- : *Mag. Hell. = J. Bidez et F. Cumont, Les mages hellénisés*, 1/2, Paris 1938.
- : *Mithr. = Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, Brussels 1896—1899.
- : *Rel. or. = Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*⁴, Paris 1929.
- : *Sepulcr. = Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, Paris 1942.
- D A C L = *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, publié par F. Cabrol et H. Leclercq*, Paris 1907 seqq.
- Deichgräber, K.: *Die griechische Empirikerschule. Sammlung der Fragmente und Darstellung der Lehre*, Berlin 1930.
- Deissmann, A.: *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*⁴, Tübingen 1923.
- : *Paulus. Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze*², Tübingen 1925.
- Dibelius, M.: *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Göttingen 1909.
- Diels, H.: *Dox. Gr. = Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin 1879.
- : *Poët. phil. = Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta* (Poetarum Graecorum fragmenta auctore Udalr. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf collecta et edita, vol. III, fasc. I), Berlin 1901.
- : *Vors. = Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 5. Auflage bearbeitet von W. Kranz, 1/3, Berlin 1934/1937.
- Dieterich, A.: *Abrax. = Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spätern Altertums*, Leipsic 1891.

- Dieterich, A.: *Kl. Schr. = Kleine Schriften*, Leipsic—Berlin 1911.
 —: *Mithr. = Eine Mithrasliturgie*³, Leipsic 1923.
 —: *Mutter Erde*³, Leipsic—Berlin 1925.
 —: *Nek. = Nekyia*², Leipsic—Berlin 1913.
 Dölger, F. J.: A Ch = *Antike und Christentum*, 1/6, Münster i. W. 1929/1940.
 —: *Exorz. = Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Alt., III Bd., 1/2 Heft), Paderborn 1909.
 —: *Ichth. = IXΘYC*, 1²/5, Münster i. W. 1922 seqq.
 —: *Sol Sal. = Sol Salutis*² (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 16/17), Münster i. W. 1925.
 —: *Sonne = Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze* (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 14), Münster i. W. 1919.
 —: *Sphrag. = Die Sphragis. Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Alt., V. Bd., 3/4 Heft), Paderborn 1911.
 D S = Daremberg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, Paris 1877 seqq.
 Emmel, K.: *Das Fortleben der antiken Lehren von der Beseelung bei den Kirchenvätern* (thesis Giessen), Borna-Leipsic 1918.
 E R E = *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by J. Hastings, Edinburgh 1908/1926.
 Fascher, E.: *Prophetes. Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Giessen 1927.
 Fasbender, H.: *Entwicklungslehre, Geburtshilfe und Gynäkologie in den hippokratischen Schriften*, Stuttgart 1897.
 Faye, E. de: *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*², Paris 1925.
 Festugière, A. J.: *L'idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Evangile*, Paris 1932.
 F G H = *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, herausgegeben von F. Jacoby. Berlin—Leyden 1923 seqq.
 Förster, W.: *Von Valentin zu Herakleon. Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Entwicklung der valentinianischen Gnosis* (Beihefte Z N T W, 7), Giessen 1928.
 Fl. Patr. = *Florilegium Patristicum*, Bonn 1904 seqq.
 Friedländer, L.: *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, 1—4¹⁰, Leipsic 1922.
 G C S = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Berlin 1897 seqq.
 Geffcken, J.: *Ausg. = Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*², Heidelberg 1929.
 —: *Kyn. = Kynika und Verwandtes*, Heidelberg 1909.
 —: *Zw. gr. Apol. = Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipsic—Berlin 1907.
 Gronau, K.: *Pos. = Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesis-exegese*, Leipsic—Berlin 1914.
 —: *Theod. = Das Theodizeeproblem in der altchristlichen Auffassung*, Tübingen 1922.
 Gruppe, O.: *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich 1906.
 Harder, R.: *Ocell. = 'Ocellus Lucanus'. Text und Kommentar* (Neue

- philologische Untersuchungen, herausgegeben von Werner Jaeger, Erstes Heft), Berlin 1926.
- Harnack, A. von: *Dogm. = Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1⁵, Tübingen 1931.
- : *Lit. = Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2, Leipsic 1904.
- : *Medic. = Medicinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 8. Bd., 4. Heft), Leipsic 1892.
- : *Miss. = Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*⁴, Leipsic 1924.
- : *Orig. = Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten der Origenes*, 1. 2. (Texte und Untersuchungen, 42. Bd, 3/4. Heft), Leipsic 1918. 1919.
- Heinemann, I.: *Phil. = Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, Breslau 1932.
- : *Poseid. = Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*, 1/2, Breslau 1921. 1928.
- Heinze, R.: *Xenokrates*, Leipsic 1892.
- Helm, R.: *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipsic—Berlin 1906.
- Hennecke, E.: *Handb. = Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1914.
- : *Apokr. = Neutestamentliche Apokryphen ... herausgegeben von E. Hennecke*², Tübingen 1924.
- Herm. Trismeg. = *The writings of Hermes Trismegistos ... ed. W. Scott*, 1—4, London 1924 seqq.
- Herzog-Hauck = *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, herausgegeben von J. J. Herzog und A. Hauck³, Leipsic 1896/1913.
- Hilgenfeld, A.: *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic 1884.
- Hirzel, R.: *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften*, 1—3, Leipsic 1877/1883.
- Hopfner, Th.: *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, 1. 2, Leipsic 1921. 1924.
- I L C V = *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, ed. E. Diehl, Berlin 1924 seqq.
- Jaeger, W.: *Arist. = Aristoteles, Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin 1923.
- : *Diokl. = Diokles von Karystos, die griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles*, Berlin 1938.
- : *Nem. = Nemesios von Emesa*, Berlin 1914.
- : *Pneuma = Das Pneuma im Lykeion*, Hermes 48 (1913), 29/74.
- Kroll, J.: *Gott und Hölle* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 20), Leipsic 1932.
- : *Herm. = Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, XIII, 2—4)², Münster i. W. 1928.
- Labriolle, P. de: *La réaction païenne*, Paris 1934.
- Lang, W.: *Das Traumbuch des Synesius von Kyrene* (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 10), Tübingen 1926.

- Leisegang, H.: *Hl. Geist = Der hl. Geist*, I 1, Leipsic 1919.
 —: *Pneuma Hagion* (Veröff. des Forschungsinstituts für vergl. Religionsgeschichte a. d. Univ. Leipzig), Leipsic 1922.
 Liechtenhan, R.: *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus*, Göttingen 1901.
 Lietzmann, H.: *G. A. K. = Geschichte der alten Kirche*, 1/3, Berlin 1932.
 —: *Hdb. N. T. = Handbuch zum Neuen Testament . . . herausgegeben von H. Lietzmann*, Tübingen 1906 seqq.
 Marrou, H. I.: *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris 1938.
 Meyer, H.: *Geschichte der Lehre von den Keimkräften von der Stoa bis zum Ausgang der Patristik*, Bonn 1914.
 Nilsson, M.: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich 1941.
 Norden, E.: *Agn. = Agnostos Theos*, Leipsic—Berlin 1913.
 —: *Die Geburt des Kindes. Geschichte einer religiösen Idee*² (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 3), Leipsic 1931.
 Peterson, E.: *Εἰς Θεός*, Göttingen 1926.
 P G M = *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri herausgegeben von K. Preisendanz*, Leipsic—Berlin 1928 seqq.
 Pohlenz, M.: *Vom Zorne Gottes. Eine Studie über den Einfluss der griechischen Philosophie auf das alte Christentum*, Göttingen 1909.
 Prächter, K.: *Hierokles der Stoiker*, Leipsic 1901.
 Prümmer, K.: *Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt*, Leipsic 1935.
 Puech, A.: *Hist. = Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne jusqu'à la fin du 4e siècle*, 1—3, Paris 1928—1930.
 —: *Apol. = Les apologistes grecs du IIe siècle de notre ère*, Paris 1912.
 Quasten, J.: *Musik und Gesang in den Kulturen der heidnischen Antike und der christlichen Frühzeit*, Münster i. W. 1930.
 R A C = *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum . . . in Verbindung mit Franz Joseph Dölger und Hans Lietzmann und unter besonderer Mitwirkung von Jan Hendrik Waszink und Leopold Wenger herausgegeben von Theodor Klauser*, Leipsic 1940 seqq.
 R E = *Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyklopädie der Altertumswissenschaft*.
 Reinhardt, K.: *Kosm. = Kosmos und Sympathie*, Munich 1926.
 —: *Pos. = Poseidonios*, Munich 1920.
 Reitzenstein, R.: *Hell. Myst. = Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*³, Leipsic—Berlin 1927.
 —: *Hist. mon. = Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*, Göttingen 1916.
 —: *Poimandres*, Leipsic 1904.
 —: *Taufe = Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, Leipsic—Berlin 1929.
 R V V = *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, Giessen 1903 seqq.
 Rohde, E.: *Gr. Roman = Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*², Leipsic 1900.
 —: *Kl. Schr. = Kleine Schriften*, 1/2, Tübingen and Leipsic 1901.
 —: *Psyche*¹⁰, Tübingen 1925.
 Roscher = W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipsic 1884 seqq.

- Ruhl, L.: *De mortuorum iudicio* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, II 2), Giessen 1903.
- Rüsche, F.: *B L S = Blut, Leben und Seele* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Alt., 5. Ergänzungsband), Paderborn 1930.
- : *Seelenpn. = Das Seelenpneuma. Seine Entwicklung von der Hauchseele zur Geistseele* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Alt., 18. Bd., 3. Heft), Paderborn 1933.
- Schick, W.: *Favorin Περὶ παίδων τροφῆς und die antike Erziehungslehre*, Leipsic 1912.
- Schlier, H.: *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen*, Giessen 1929.
- Schmekel, A.: *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange*, Berlin 1892.
- Schmidt, H.: *Die Anthropologie Philons von Alexandria*, thesis Leipsic 1933.
- Schrijnen, J.: *Uit het leven der oude kerk*, Bussum—Utrecht 1919.
- Siebeck, H.: *Geschichte der Psychologie*, I. 1. 2, Gotha 1880. 1884.
- Soury, G.: *La démonologie de Plutarque*, thesis Paris 1942.
- Stelzenberger, J.: *Die Beziehungen der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa*, Munich 1933.
- Strache, H.: *De Arii Didymi in morali philosophia auctoribus*, thesis Berlin 1909.
- : *Der Eklektizismus des Antiochos von Askalon* (Philologische Untersuchungen, 26. Heft), Berlin 1921.
- St. V. F. = *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, collegit Ioannes ab Arnim, Leipsic 1903 seqq.
- Tamborino, J.: *De antiquorum daemonismo* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, VII 3), Giessen 1903.
- Theiler, W.: *Neuplat. = Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (Problemata, I), Berlin 1930.
- T St = *Texts and Studies. Contributions to biblical and patristic Literature*, Cambridge 1891 seqq.
- T U = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Leipsic 1883 seqq.
- Ueb.-Pr. = *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. I. Die Philosophie des Altertums*. 12. Auflage ... herausgegeben von Dr. Karl Praechter, Berlin 1926.
- Usener, H.: *Epic. = Epicurea*, Leipsic 1887.
- Völker, W.: *Philo = Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandria. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 49. Bd., 1. Heft), Leipsic 1938.
- Weinel, H.: *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus*, Freiburg i. B. 1899.
- : *Theol. N. T. = Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*⁴, Tübingen 1928.
- Wellmann, M.: *Frag. = Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte Akron, Philistion und des Diokles von Karystos*, Berlin 1901.
- : *Bolos = Die Φυσικά des Bolos-Demokritos und der Magier Anaxilaos von Larissa* (Abh. Akad. d. Wiss., Berlin, 1928, 7).

- Wellmann, M.: *Phys.* = *Der Physiologus* (Philologus, Suppl. 22 (1930), Heft 1).
- : *Pneum. Sch.* = *Die pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes in ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt* (Philologische Untersuchungen, Heft 14), Berlin 1895.
- Wendland, P.: *Kultur* = *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*^{2,3}, Tübingen 1912.
- : *Philo Vors.* = *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung*, Berlin 1892.
- Wetter, G. P. son: *Charis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums* (Unters. zum N T, herausg. von H. Windisch, Heft 5), Leipsic 1913.
- : ΦΩC (Skrifter utgivna af K. Human. Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala, 17, 1), Uppsala 1915.
- Windisch, H.: *Philo* = *Die Frömmigkeit Philos und ihre Bedeutung für das Christentum*, Leipsic 1909.
- : *Taufe* = *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes*, Tübingen 1908.
- Wissowa, G.: *Rel.* = *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², Munich 1912.
- : *Ges. Abh.* = *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte*, Munich 1904.
- Witt, R. E.: *Albinus and the history of middle Platonism*, Cambridge 1937.
- Zeller, E.: *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, I 1⁷, Leipsic 1923; I 2, *ib.* 1920; II 1⁴, *ib.* 1889; II 2³, *ib.* 1879; III 1⁴, *ib.* 1909; III 2⁴, *ib.* 1903.
- Z N T W = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

B. Linguistic and grammatical works.

- Ahlberg, A.: *Durative Zeitbestimmungen im Lateinischen*, thesis Lund (L U Å) 1905.
- Ahlquist, H.: *Studien zur spätlateinischen Mulomedicina Chironis*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1909.
- A. L. L. = *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, herausgegeben von Ed. Wölfflin, I—XV. Leipsic 1884/1908.
- Andersson, A.: *Studia Vegetiana*, thesis Uppsala 1938.
- Anecd. Mareds. = *Anecdota Maredsolana*, ed. Dom. G. Morin, 1/3. Maredsous 1893 *segg.*
- Appel, E.: *Exegetische und kritische Beiträge zu Corippus*, thesis Munich 1904.
- Audollent, A.: *Defixionum tabellae*, thesis Paris 1904.
- Axelsson, B.: *Sen.* = *Senecastudien. Kritische Bemerkungen zu Senecas Naturales Quaestiones*, thesis Lund (L U Å) 1933.
- : *N. Sen.* = *Neue Senecastudien*, Lund (L U Å) 1939.
- : *Cod. Arg.* = *Der Codex Argoratensis C VI 5. Handschriftliches und Textkritisches zum späteren Teil der Senecabriefe* (Bull. de l'Acad. roy. des lettres de Lund IV (1937), 73/105).
- : *Firm.* = *Ein drittes Werk des Firmicus Maternus? Zur Kritik der philologischen Identifizierungsmethode* (*ib.*, IV (1937), 107/132).
- : *Alex.* = *Zum Alexanderroman des Iulius Valerius. Textkritische Beiträge* (*ib.*, III (1935/1936), 29/60).

- Baehrens, W. A.: *Beitr.* = *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*, Philologus, Suppl. 12 (1912), 235/556.
- : *App.* = *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur Appendix Probi*, Halle 1922.
- : *Orig.* = *Die lateinisch erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament* (T. u. U., 42,1).
- : *Obs.* = *Ad Panegyricos Latinos aliosque scriptores observationes*, Mnemosyne, N. S. 38 (1910), 395/436.
- Balmus, Const. I.: *Étude sur le style de Saint Augustin dans les Confessions et la Cité de Dieu*, Paris 1930.
- Bauer, W.: *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Giessen 1928.
- Bayard, L.: *Le Latin de Saint Cyprien*, Paris 1902.
- Bednara, E.: *De sermone dactylicorum Latinorum quaestiones* (A. L. L. 14, 317/360 and 532/604).
- Bellanger, L.: *In Antonini Placentini itinerarium grammatica disquisitio*, thesis Paris 1902.
- Bendz, G.: *Frontin. I* = *Die Echtheitsfrage des vierten Buches der frontinschen Strategemata*, thesis Lund (L U Å). 1938.
- : *Frontin. II* = *Textkritische und interpretatorische Bemerkungen zu den frontinschen Strategemata* (Bull. de la Soc. roy. des lettres de Lund, 1942/1943, II).
- : *Cael.* = *Caeliana. Textkritische und sprachliche Studien zu Caelius Aurelianus*, Lund (L U Å) 1943.
- Bennett, Ch. E.: *Syntax of early Latin*, 1/2, Boston 1910. 1914.
- Bernhard, M.: *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura* (Tüb. Beitr. z. Altertumsw., Heft 2), Stuttgart 1927.
- Biese, G. M.: *Der spätlateinische Akkusativus absolutus und Verwandtes*, Helsingfors 1928.
- Blass-Debrunner = *Fr. Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, bearbeitet von A. Debrunner, 6. Auflage, Göttingen 1931.
- Blatt, Fr.: *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos*. (Beiheft zur Zeitschr. f. d. neustest. Wiss., 12), Giessen 1930.
- Blomgren, S.: *Fort.*, 1/2 = *Studia Fortunatiana*, 1/2, Uppsala (U U Å) 1933. 1934.
- : *Amm. Marc.* = *De sermone Ammiani Marcellini quaestiones variae*, Uppsala (U U Å) 1937.
- : *Sil.* = *Siliana*, Uppsala (U U Å) 1938.
- Bonnet, M.: *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, thesis Paris 1890.
- Brewer, H.: *Kommodian von Gaza* (Forschungen zur christl. Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, VI, 1/2), Paderborn 1906.
- Brolén, C. A.: *De elocutione A. Corn. Celsi*, thesis Uppsala 1872.
- Carlsson, G.: *Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe*, thesis Lund (L U Å) 1922.
- Carnoy, A.: *Le latin d'Espagne*², Brussels 1906.
- Caspari, C. P.: *Anecd.* = *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota. I. Lateinische Schriften*, Christiania 1883.
- : *Briefe, Abh. Pred.* = *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten des kirchl. Alterthums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters*, Christiania 1890.

- Cavallin, S.: *Literarhistorische und textkritische Studien zur Vita S. Caesarii Arelatensis*, thesis Lund (L U Å) 1934.
- Chrüzander, G.: *De elocutione Panegyricorum veterum Gallicanorum*, thesis Uppsala 1897.
- Coll. Schrijn. = *Collectanea Schrijnen. Verspreide opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen*, Nimeguen—Utrecht 1939.
- Comm. Woelff. = *Commentationes Woelfflinianae*, Leipsic 1891.
- Cooper, F. T.: *Word Formation in the Roman sermo plebeius*, New York 1895.
- C G L = *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. G. Goetz, I/VII, Leipsic 1888/1923.
- C I L = *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*.
- C S E L = *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna 1866 seqq.
- Dahlöf, N.: *Tempora och modi hos Columella*, thesis Göteborg 1931.
- Dahlmann = *Varro De lingua Latina Buch VIII, erklärt von H. Dahlmann* (Hermes-Einzelschriften, Heft 7), Berlin 1940.
- Dörrie, H.: *Passio SS Macchabaeorum, die antike lateinische Übersetzung des I V. Makkabäerbuches* (Abh. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 22), Göttingen 1938.
- Draeger, A.: *Synt. = Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, 1/2^a, Leipsic 1878. 1881.
- : *Tac. = Syntax und Stil des Tacitus^a*, Leipsic 1882.
- Dubois, A.: *La latinité d'Ennodius*, thesis Paris 1903.
- Ebert, A.: *De syntaxi Frontoniana* (Acta semin. philol. Erlang. 1 (1878), 101/171; 2 (1881), 311/357).
- Edmar, B.: *Studien zu den Epistulae ad Caesarem senem de republica*, thesis Lund 1931.
- Elg, A. G.-son: *In Faustum Reiensem studia*, thesis Uppsala 1937.
- Elss, H.: *Untersuchungen über den Stil und die Sprache des Venantius Fortunatus*, thesis Heidelberg 1907.
- Engelbrecht, A.: *Claud. Mam. = Untersuchungen über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus*, Vienna 1885.
- : *Sidon. = Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Briefe des Apollinaris Sidonius, Faustus und Ruricius* (Ztschr. österr. Gymn. 41 (1890), 481/497 and 677/699).
- Engelhardt, A.: *Tacitea* (thesis Freiburg i. B.), Karlsruhe 1928.
- Englund, J.: *Kasussyntaxen hos A. Cornelius Celsus*, thesis Göteborg 1935.
- Englund, Y.: *Ad Quintiliani quae feruntur Declamationes maiores adnotationes*, thesis Uppsala 1934.
- Eranos, *Acta philologica Suecana*, 1 seqq. Uppsala-Göteborg 1896 seqq.
- Erikson, A.: *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio evangeliorum*, thesis Lund 1939.
- Eriksson, N.: *Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus*, thesis Lund 1934.
- Ernout-Meillet = *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine par A. Ernout et A. Meillet*, Paris 1932.
- Fassbender, Chr.: *De Iuli Valeri sermone quaestiones selectae*, thesis Münster i. W. 1909.

- Ferrère, H.: *Langue et style de Victor de Vita* (Rev. de philol. 25 (1901), 110/123 and 320/336).
- Fesser, H. *Sprachliche Betrachtungen zu Ammianus Marcellinus*, thesis Breslau 1932.
- Forcellini, *Lexicon totius Latinitatis*, cur. V. de Vit, Prato 1858/1875.
- Freund, J. W.: *De C. Suetonii Tranquilli usu atque genere dicendi*, thesis Berlin 1901.
- Friebel, O.: *Fulgentius, der Mythograph und Bischof* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. d. Alt. V, 1/2), Paderborn 1911.
- Frobenius, R.: *Die Syntax des Ennius* (thesis Tübingen), Nördlingen 1910.
- Gabarrou, F.: *Le latin d'Arnobé*, thesis Paris 1921.
- Gabler, X.: *De elocutione M. Fabi Quintiliani*, thesis Erlangen 1910.
- Gagner, A.: *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition apud*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1931.
- Gebhardt, O. von: *Lateinische Uebersetzungen der Acta Pauli et Theclae* (T. u. U. 22, 2), Leipsic 1902.
- Geisau, J. von: *De Apulei syntaxi poetica et graecanica*, thesis Münster i. W. 1912.
- : *Synt. = Syntaktische Gräzismen bei Apuleius* (I. F. 36 (1916), 70/98 and 242/287).
- Georges, K. E.: *Ausführliches lateinisches-deutsches Handwörterbuch. Siebente Auflage I—II*, Hannover 1879—1880.
- Gerber-Greef = A. Gerber und A. Greef, *Lexicon Taciteum*, Leipsic 1903.
- Geyer, P.: *Kritische . . . Erläuterungen zu Antonini Placentini Itinerarium* (thesis Erlangen), Augsburg 1892.
- Ghellinck, J. de, S. J.: *Latin chrétien ou langue latine des chrétiens* (Ét. class. 8 (1939), 449/78).
- Gimborn, Th.: *The Syntax of the simple cases in St. Hilary of Poitiers* (Patristic Studies, vol. LIV), Washington 1939.
- Glotta. Zeitschrift für griech. und lat. Sprache, Göttingen 1909 seqq.
- Gnomon, Krit. Zeitschrift für die gesamte klass. Altertumswissenschaft, Berlin 1925 seqq.
- Goelzer, H.: *Sev. = grammaticae in Sulpicium Severum observationes*, thesis Paris 1883.
- : *Jér. = Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme*, Paris 1894.
- : *Avit = Le latin de Saint Avit*, Paris 1909.
- GL = *Grammatici Latini*, rec. H. Keil, Leipsic 1857—1880.
- Grandgent, C. H.: *An introduction to vulgar Latin*, Boston 1907.
- Grevander, S.: *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Mulomedicina Chironis*, thesis Lund (LU Å) 1926.
- Gudeman, A.: *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus mit Prolegomena, Text und adnotatio critica, exegetischem und kritischem Kommentar . . . von A. Gudeman*², Leipsic-Berlin 1914.
- Haag, O.: *Die Latinität Fredegars*, thesis Erlangen 1898 (= Roman. Forschungen 10, 835/932).
- Hagendahl, H.: *Amm. = Studia Ammianea*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1921.

- Hagendahl, H.: *Perf. = Die Perfektformen auf -ere und -erunt. Ein Beitrag zur Technik der spätlateinischen Kunstprosa*, Uppsala 1923.
- : *Arnob. = La prose métrique d'Arnobé* (Acta universitatis Goto-burgensis, 42 (1936), 1).
- Hand, F.: *Tursellinus I—IV*, Leipsic 1829—1845.
- Hårleman, E.: *De Claudiano Mamerto gallicae latinitatis scriptore quaestiones*, thesis Uppsala 1938.
- Hartel, W. von: *Luc. = Lucifer von Cagliari und sein Latein* (A. L. L. 3, 1/58).
- Hausleiter: *De versionibus pastoris Hermae latinis* (Acta semin. Erlangensis, 3 (1884), 399/477).
- Havers, W.: *Handb. = Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, Heidelberg 1931.
- : *Nom. = Zur Syntax des Nominativs* (Glotta 16 (1927), 1 seqq.).
- Hedfors, Hj.: *Compositiones ad tingenda musiva*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1932.
- Heer, J. M.: *Die versio latina des Barnabasbriefes*, thesis Freiburg i. B. 1908.
- Heidrich, G.: *Der Stil des Varro*, Melk 1892.
- Hellmuth, H.: *De sermonis proprietatibus, quae in prioribus Ciceronis orationibus inveniuntur* (Acta semin. Erlangensis, 1 (1878), 101/174).
- Heraeus, W.: *Kl. Schr. = Kleine Schriften*, Heidelberg 1937.
- Heubner, C.: *De belli Hispaniensis commentario quaestiones grammaticae*, thesis Berlin 1916.
- Heumann-Seckel = *Heumanns Handbuch zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts. In neuer Auflage neu bearbeitet von Dr. E. Seckel*, Jena 1907.
- Hofmann, J. B.: *Synt. = Stolz-Schmalz: Lateinische Grammatik. 5. Aufl. 2. Lieferung: Syntax und Stilistik, neubearbeitet von J. B. Hofmann*, Munich 1928.
- : *Umg. = Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg 1926; *Nachträge, ib.* 1936.
- Hoogterp, P. W.: *Étude sur le latin du codex Bobiensis (k) des Évangiles* (thesis Groningen), Wageningen 1930.
- Hoppe, H.: *Rufin = Griechisches bei Rufin* (Glotta 26 (1937), 132/144).
- Horn, F.: *Zur Geschichte der absoluten Partizipialkonstruktionen im Lateinischen*, thesis Lund 1918.
- Hunger, G.: *Die Syntax des spätlateinischen Oribasius*, thesis Breslau 1933.
- Hyltén, P.: *Studien zu Sulpicius Severus*, thesis Lund 1940.
- I. F. = *Indogermanische Forschungen*. Strassburg—Berlin 1892 seqq.
- Immisch, O.: *Sprach- und stilgeschichtliche Parallelen zwischen Griechisch und Lateinisch* (Neue Jahrb. für d. klass. Alt. 29 (1912), 27/49).
- Janssen, H.: *Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. VIII), Nimeguen 1938.
- Janssen, O.: *L'expressivité chez Salvien de Marseille* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. VII), Nimeguen 1937.
- Jeanneret, M.: *La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines*, thesis Neuchâtel 1918.

- Jordan, H.: *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Berlin 1879.
- Junel, B.: *In Cassium Felicem Studia*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1936.
- Juret, A. C.: *Synt. = Système de la syntaxe latine*², Paris 1932.
- , P. C.: *Fil. = Étude grammaticale sur le latin de S. Filastrius* (thesis Fribourg), Erlangen 1904.
- Kalb, W.: *Jur. lat. = Das Juristenlatein*², Erlangen 1888.
- : *Jur. = Roms Juristen nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt*, Leipsic 1890.
- Kalén, H.: *Studia in Iordanem philologica*, thesis Uppsala 1939.
- Katwijk, A. F. van: *Lexicon Commodianum*, thesis Amsterdam 1934.
- Kaulen, F.: *Sprachliches Handbuch zur biblischen Vulgata*², Freiburg i. B. 1904.
- Kistner, K.: *Arnobiana*, St.-Ingbert 1911/1912.
- Kittel = G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1933 seqq.
- Klotz, A.: *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense*, Leipsic—Berlin 1927.
- Koch, H.: *Cypr. = Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte herausgegeben von Karl Holl und Hans Lietzmann, 4), Bonn 1926.
- : *Gelas. = Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienste seiner Vorgänger* (Sitz. Ber. Bay. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., 1935, Heft 6).
- : *Novat. = La lingua e lo stile di Novaziano* (Religio 13 (1937), 278/294).
- Koehler, A.: *De auctorum belli Africani et belli Hispaniensis latinitate* (Acta seminarii philol. Erlangensis, 1 (1878), 367/471).
- Koffmane, G.: *Geschichte der Kirchenlateins*, I, 1. 2, Breslau 1879. 1881.
- Konjetzny, G.: *De idiotismis syntacticis in titulis latinis urbanis* (C. I. L. vol. VI) *conspicuis* (A. L. L. 15, 297/351).
- Kraus, L.: *Die poetische Sprache des Paulinus Nolanus*, thesis Würzburg 1918.
- Krebs-Schmalz = J. Ph. Krebs, *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*. 7 . . . durchgesehene Auflage von J. H. Schmalz, 1/2, Basel 1905. 1907.
- Kroll, W.: *Stud. = Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924.
- : *Synt. = Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht*³, Berlin 1925.
- : *Arnob. = Arnobiusstudien* (Rh. Mus., N. F. 72 (1918), 62/112).
- Krumbiegel, R.: *De Varroniano scribendi genere quaestiones*, thesis Leipsic 1892.
- K. St. = *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* von R. Kühner. Zweiter Teil. Satzlehre. Zweite Auflage neubearbeitet von C. Stegmann, 1/2, Hannover 1912. 1914.
- Landgraf, G.: *Rosc. = Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*², Leipsic—Berlin 1914.
- Lavarenne, M.: *Étude sur la langue du poète Prudence*, thesis Paris 1933.
- Lebreton, J.: *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*, Paris 1901.
- Liddell & Scott: *A greek-english Lexikon*. Ninth edition, Oxford 1925 seqq.
- Liechtenhan, E.: *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Marcellus Empiricus*, thesis Basel 1917.

- Lilliedahl, Sv.: *Florusstudien*, thesis Lund (L U Å) 1928.
- Linde, H.: *Studier till Columellas Nionde Bok*, thesis Göteborg 1936.
- Linderbauer, B.: *S. Benedicti Regula Monachorum, herausgegeben und philologisch erklärt*, Benediktinerstift Metten 1922.
- Lindgren, Hj.: *Studia Curtiana*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1935.
- Lindholm, E.: *Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen*, thesis Lund 1931.
- Lindsay, W. M.: *The Latin Language*, Oxford 1894.
- Löfstedt, E.: *Beitr. = Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1907.
- : *Spätlat. Stud. = Spätlateinische Studien*, Uppsala 1908.
- : *Per. = Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1911.
- : *Arn. = Arnobiana*, Lund (L U Å) 1917.
- : *Synt.*, 1, 2 = *Syntactica*, 1, 2 (Acta Reg. Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund, X: 1, 2), Lund 1: 1928; 2: 1933.
- : *Verm. = Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* (Acta Reg. Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund, XXIII), Lund 1936.
- Lögberg, G.: *In Macrobi Saturnalia adnotationes*, thesis Uppsala 1936.
- Lottritz, Jos.: *De Scribonii Largi genere dicendi*, thesis Bonn 1913.
- Lyngby, H.: *Textkritiska studier till Celsus' Medicina*, thesis Göteborg 1931.
- Madvig, J. N.: *Fin. = M. Tullii Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum libri V³*, Copenhagen 1876.
- Martin, J.: *Comm. = Commodiana* (kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, philos.-hist. klasse, Sitz. Ber., Bd. 181, 6), Vienna 1917.
- : *Stud. = Studien und Beiträge zur Erklärung und Zeitbestimmung Commodians* (T. u. U., 3 R., Bd. 9, Heft 4), Leipsic 1913.
- Marx, F.: *Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein*, Neue Jahrb. 23 (1909), 434/448.
- Matzkow, W.: *De vocabulis quibusdam Italae et Vulgatae Christianis*, thesis Berlin 1933.
- Médan, P.: *La latinité d'Apulée dans les Métamorphoses*, thesis Paris 1926.
- Modert, J.: *Quaestiones criticae et grammaticae ad Gynaecia Mustionis pertinentia*, thesis Giessen 1911.
- Meillet, A.: *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, Paris 1938.
- Meister, K.: *Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen, Heft I: Altitalische und römische Eigennamen*, Leipsic—Berlin 1916.
- Merkx, F. A. H. J.: *Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. IX), Nimeguen 1939.
- Meyer-Lübke, W.: *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch³*, Heidelberg 1930—1935.
- Migne, P. G. = *Patrologiae cursus completus. Ser. I. Patres Graeci*, 1—161, Paris 1857/1866.
- Migne, P. L. = *Patrologiae cursus completus. Ser. II. Patres Latini*, 1—217, Paris 1844/1865.

- Mohrmann, Chr.: *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. III), Nimeguen 1932.
- M G H = *Monumenta Germaniae historica*.
- Mörland, H.: *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen*, thesis Oslo (Symbolae Osloenses, Suppl. 5) 1932.
- Mossberg, K.—Å.: *Studia Sidoniana critica et semasiologica*, thesis Uppsala 1934.
- Müller, C. F. W.: *Syntax des Nominativus und Akkusativus im Lateinischen* (Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, Supplement), Leipsic—Berlin 1908.
- Müller, Ch.: *Observationes grammaticae in Paulini Pellaei carmen Eucharisticum*, thesis Berlin 1933.
- Müller, J.: *Der Stil des älteren Plinius*, Innsbruck 1883.
- Müller, M.: *Untersuchungen zum Carmen adversus Marcionitas* (thesis Würzburg), Ochsenfurt a. M. 1936.
- Müller-Marquardt, Fr.: *Die Sprache der alten Vita Wandregiseli*, Halle 1912.
- Neue-Wag. = F. F. Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. 3. Aufl. von C. Wagener, Leipsic 1892/1905.
- Norberg, D.: *In Registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica*, I. 2, Uppsala (U U Å) 1937. 1939.
- Nordeblad, J. B.: *Gaiusstudien*, thesis Lund 1932.
- Norden, E.: *Min. = De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi* (Wiss. Beilage zum Vorlesungsverzeichniss der Universität Greifswald, Ostern 1897), Greifswald 1897.
- : *Kunstpr. = Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, I. II, vierter Abdruck, Leipsic—Berlin 1923.
- : *Aen. VI = P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI erklärt von* —³, Leipsic—Berlin 1926.
- Nyström, G.: *Variatio sermonis hos Columella*, thesis Göteborg 1926.
- Oorde, W. van: *Lexicon Aetherianum*, thesis Amsterdam 1930.
- Parriger, F. H.: *Aanschouwelijkheidsdrang als factor bij de beteekenisonwikkeling der Latijnsche praepositie*, thesis Utrecht 1941.
- Paucker, C.: *Supplementum lexicorum latinorum*, Berlin 1883.
- Persson, P.: *Kritisch-exegetische Bemerkungen zu den kleinen Schriften des Tacitus*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1927.
- Petersson, A.: *De epitoma Justini quaestiones criticae*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1926.
- Pettersson, O.: *Commentationes Livianae*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1930.
- Pfister, F.: *Vulgärlatein und Vulgärgriechisch* (Rh. Mus., N. F. 67 (1912), 195/208).
- Pirson, J.: *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule*, Brussels 1901.
- Plater-White = W. E. Plater and H. J. White, *A grammar of the Vulgata*, Oxford 1926.
- Pomoell, R.: *Textkritiska studier till Columellas V bok* (thesis Åbo), Göteborg 1931.

- Prendergast, Sister M. A. C.: *The Latinity of the De Vita Contemplativa of Julianus Pomerius* (Patristic Studies, Vol. LV), Washington 1938.
- Radermacher, L.: *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*² (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 1), Tübingen 1925.
- Regnier, A.: *De la latinité des sermons de S. Augustin*, Paris 1886.
- Reisig-Haase, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. III. Lateinische Syntax, neu bearbeitet von J. H. Schmalz und G. Landgraf*, Berlin 1888.
- Reiter, H.: *Quaestiones Varronianae grammaticae*, thesis Königsberg 1882.
- R E L = *Revue des Études Latines*, Paris 1923 seqq.
- Riemann, O.: *Liv. = Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live*², Paris 1885.
- : *Synt. = Syntaxe latine ... sixième éd. revue par P. Lejay*, Paris 1920.
- Rochus, L.: *La latinité de Salvien*, Brussels 1934.
- Rönsch, H.: *It. = Itala und Vulgata*², Marburg 1875.
- : *Sem. = Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch*, 1/3, Leipsic 1887/1889.
- Sainio, M.: *Semasiologische Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität* (Annal. Acad. Scient. Fennicae, B XLVII, 1), Helsinki 1940.
- Salonius, A. H.: *Vit. Patr. = Vitae Patrum* (Acta Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund., II), Lund 1920.
- Schäfer, K. Th.: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hebräerbriefs* (Röm. Quartalschrift, 23. Suppl. Heft), Freiburg i. B. 1929.
- Scheps, N.: *Sedulius' Paschale Carmen. Boek I en II ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht* (thesis Amsterdam, 'Vrije Universiteit'), Delft 1938.
- Schepss, G.: *Die Sprache Priscillians*, A. L. L. 3, 309/28.
- Schondörffer, O.: *De syntaxi Catonis*, thesis Königsberg 1885.
- Schrijnen, Jos.: *Char. = Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. I), Nimeguen 1932.
- : *Lat. chrét. = Le latin chrétien devenu langue commune*, Rev. Ét. Lat. 12 (1934), 96/116.
- Schrijn-Mohrm.: *Cypr. = Jos. Schrijnen und Chr. Mohrmann, Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian*, 1/2 (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. V. VI), Nimeguen 1936. 1937.
- Schulze, W.: *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Abhandl. Götting. Ges. d. Wiss., 5: 5), Berlin 1904.
- Sjögren, H.: *Fut. = Zum gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1906.
- : *Tull. = Commentationes Tullianae*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1910.
- : *Att. = Ad Ciceronis epistulas ad Atticum adnotationes*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1927.
- Skutsch, F.: *Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll*, Leipsic—Berlin 1914.
- Sobel, R.: *Studia Columelliana*, thesis Göteborg 1928.

- Sommer, F.: *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* ^{2/3}, Heidelberg 1914.
- Sörbom, G.: *Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaque apud eundem quaestiones selectae*, thesis Uppsala 1935.
- Souter, A.: *Ambrst.* = *A Study of Ambrosiaster* (Texts and Studies, VIII 4), Cambridge 1905.
- : *Comm.* = *The earliest Latin commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1927.
- : *Pel.* = *Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul. I. Introduction*, Cambridge 1922.
- Spindler, P.: *De Arnobii genere dicendi*, thesis Strassburg 1901.
- Stangl, Th.: *Tulliana et Mario-Victorina*, Progr. k. Luitpold-Gymn. Munich 1888.
- : *Bob.* = *Bobiensia*, Progr. Munich 1904.
- : *Pseudoasc.* = *Pseudoasconiana* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. d. Alt., II, 4/5), Paderborn 1909.
- Stix, J.: *Zum Sprachgebrauch des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers in seiner Schrift de trinitate*, Progr. Rottweil 1891.
- Stren. Ups. = *Strena Philologica Upsaliensis, Festschrift tillägnad Professor Per Persson*, Uppsala 1922.
- Stummer, F.: *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel*, Paderborn 1928.
- Sundelin, T.: *Ad Theodori Prisciani Euporista adnotationes*, thesis Uppsala 1934.
- Süss, W.: *Stud.* = *Studien zur lateinischen Bibel*, 1, Dorpat 1932.
- Svenberg, E.: *De latinska lunaria*, thesis Göteborg 1936.
- Svennung, J.: *Oros.* = *Orosiana*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1922.
- : *Orib.* = *Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen*, Uppsala 1932.
- : *Pallad.* = *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*, Uppsala 1935.
- : *Luc.* = *Compositiones Lucenses. Studien zum Inhalt, zur Textkritik und Sprache*, Uppsala (U U Å) 1941.
- Symb. Dan. = *Symbolae philologicae O. A. Danielsson octogenario dicatae*, Uppsala 1932.
- Thes. l. L. = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipsic 1900 seqq.
- Thiele, G.: *Der lateinische Äsop des Romulus und die Prosa-Fassungen des Phädrus*, Heidelberg 1910.
- Thörnell, G.: *Pan.* = *Studia Panegyrica*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1905.
- : *Patr.* = *Patristica*, Uppsala (U U Å) 1923.
- : *Lucif.* = *Studia Luciferiana*, Uppsala—Leipsic 1933.
- Tidner, E.: *Part.* = *De particulis copulativis apud Scriptores Historiae Augustae quaestiones selectae*, thesis Uppsala (U U Å) 1922.
- : *Serm.* = *De sermone in Didascalia apostolorum Latina quaestiones*, I. II, *Eranos* 24 (1926), 155/82; 25 (1927), 55/78.
- : *Did.* = *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didascalia apostolorum*, Stockholm 1938.
- Väänänen, V.: *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions Pompéiennes* (Ann. Acad. Scient. Fennicae, B, XL, 2), Helsinki 1937.

- Vahlen, J.: *Opusc. = Opuscula Academica*, 1. 2, Leipsic 1907. 1908.
 —: *Ges. Philol. Schr. = Gesammelte philologische Schriften*, 1. 2, Leipsic—Berlin 1911. 1923.
- Vroom, H. B.: *De Commodiani metro et syntaxi annotationes*, thesis Utrecht 1917.
- Wackernagel, J.: *Synt. = Vorlesungen über Syntax*, 1². 2², Basel 1926. 1928.
- : *Gen. = Genetiv und Adjektiv* (Mélanges de linguistique offertes à M. Ferdinand de Saussure (Paris 1908), 123/152).
- Wahlén, S.: *Studia critica in Declamationes minores quae sub nomine Quintiliani feruntur*, thesis Uppsala 1930.
- Walde, A.: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3. Auflage von J. B. Hofmann, Heidelberg 1930 seqq.
- Waszink, J. H.: *res. mort. = Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum et de iudicio Domini* (Florilegium Patristicum, Suppl. I), Bonn 1937.
- Watson, E. W.: *The style and language of St. Cyprian* (Studia biblica et ecclesiastica, IV (Oxford 1896), 189/324).
- Werner, F.: *Die Latinität der Getica des Jordanis*, thesis Halle 1908.
- Westermann, J. F.: *Archaische en archaïstische woordkunst* (thesis Amsterdam), Nimeguen 1938.
- Weyman, C.: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, Munich 1926.
- Widstrand, H.: *Palladiusstudien*, thesis Uppsala 1926.
- Wikström, T.: *In Firmicum Maternum studia critica*, thesis Uppsala 1935.
- Wiman, G.: *Testkritiska studier till Arnobius*, Göteborg 1931.
- Wistrand, E.: *Vitruviusstudier*, thesis Göteborg 1933.
- Wohleb, L.: *Die lateinische Übersetzung der Didache* (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Alt., VII, 1), Paderborn 1913.
- Wölfflin, E.: *Compar. = Lateinische und romanische Comparison*, Erlangen 1879.
- : *Schr. = Ausgewählte Schriften*, Leipsic 1933.

INDICES

I. INDEX OF PROPER NAMES OCCURRING IN DE ANIMA

1. *Philosophers and schools of philosophers.*

Academia 17, 11 (twice).
 Academici 17, 2.
 Aenesidemus 9, 5; 14, 5; 25, 2.
 Albinus 28, 1; 29, 4.
 Anaxagoras 12, 2; 12, 5; 43, 2.
 Anaximenes 9, 5.
 Apollophanes 14, 2.
 Aristoteles 3, 3; 5, 1; 6, 7; 12, 3/5;
 14, 2/3; 15, 3; 19, 2; 32, 4; 43, 2;
 46, 3; 46, 10; 49, 2/3.
 Arius 54, 2; 55, 4.
 Chrysippus 5, 6; 6, 8; 14, 2; 31, 6.
 Cleanthes 5, 4; 25, 9.
 Critias 5, 2.
 Critolaus 5, 1; 5, 2.
 Democritus 12, 6; 15, 3; 43, 2; 51, 2.
 Dicaearchus 15, 2/3 (Messenius aliqui
 D. 15, 2).
 Empedocles 3, 2; 5, 2; 8, 1; 15, 3;
 15, 5; 17, 2; 20, 3; 32, *passim*;
 33, 6; 43, 2; 54, 1.
 Epicharmus 18, 1; 46, 10/1; 47, 3.
 Epicurei 17, 4; 43, 2.
 Epicurus 3, 2; 5, 2; 15, 3; 15, 5;
 31, 6; 32, 4; 42, 1; 46, 2/3; 50, 2.
 Eubulus 5, 1.
 Heraclides Ponticus 9, 5; 46, 6.
 Heraclitus 2, 6; 3, 2; 5, 2; 9, 5; 14, 5;
 15, 5; 17, 2.
 Hipparchus (instead of Hippasus) 5, 2.
 [Hippasus, cf. Hipparchus].
 Hippon 5, 2.
 Panaetius 14, 2.
 Parmenides 43, 2.
 Peripatetici 5, 2.
 Pherecydes 2, 3; 28, 5.
 Plato 2, 3; 3, 2; 4 (twice); 5, 1; 6, 7;
 9, 2; 10, 1; 14, 2; 15, 3; 15, 5;
 16, 1/3; 17, 2; 17, 12; 18, 1; 18, 3;
 18, 12; 20, 3; 23, 5; 23, 6 (twice);
 24, 3; 24, 9/11; 25, 2; 25, 8; 28, 1/2;
 29, 4; 31, 6; 32, 4; 36, 1; 46, 9;
 48, 2; 51, 2; 52, 3; 54, 1/2; 54, 4;
 55, 4.
 Platonici 6, 1. -us (*adj.*) 24, 3; 26, 3;
 43, 11; 53, 5.
 Posidonius 14, 2.
 Protagoras (instead of Praxagoras)
 15, 6.

Pythagoras 2, 3; 28, *passim*; 31, *pas-
 sim*; 32, 4; 33, 6; 34, 1; 54, 1.
 Pythagorici 48, 3. -us (*adj.*) 28, 1; 35, 5.
 Seneca 20, 1; 42, 2.
 Socrates 1, *passim*; 6, 7; 12, 1; 15, 3;
 17, 12; 25, 8; 39, 3; 46, 9.
 Stoici 5, 2; 6, 7; 14, 2; 17, 4; 25, 2;
 43, 2; 43, 5; 46, 11; 54, 1/2; 55, 4.
 -us (*adj.*) 26, 3.
 Strato 14, 5; 15, 3; 15, 5 (-*Physicus*);
 43, 2; 46, 10.
 Thales 5, 2; 6, 8.
 Xenocrates 5, 1; 15, 5.
 Xenophanes 43, 2.
 Zeno (Eleates) 58, 5.
 Zeno (Stoicus) 3, 2; 5, 3; 14, 2; 31, 6.

2. *Physicians.*

Andreas 15, 2/3.
 Apollodorus 15, 6.
 Asclepiades 15, 2 (twice); 15, 3; 15, 6;
 25, 5; 38, 1.
 Chrysippus 15, 6.
 Diocles 15, 3; 17, 2;
 Erasistratus 15, 3; 15, 5; 25, 5.
 Herophilus 10, 4; 15, 3; 15, 5; 25, 5.
 Hicesius 25, 2; 25, 6.
 Hippocrates 15, 3; 15, 5; 25, 5.
 Moschion 15, 5.
 [Praxagoras: cf. 1 s. v. Protagoras].
 Soranus 6, 6 (twice); 6, 7; 8, 3; 14, 2;
 15, 3; 25, 5; 44, 2.
 Strato 15, 5.

3. *Heretics.*

Apelles 23, 3; 36, 3.
 Carpocrates 23, 2; 35, 1; 35, 4.
 Gnostici 18, 4.
 Helena (Tyria) 34, 2; 35, 1.
 Hermogenes 1, 1; 3, 4; 11, 2; 21, 6;
 22, 1; 24, 2; 24, 10.
 Marcion 17, 14; 21, 6.
 Menander 23, 1; 50, 2/5.
 Philumena 36, 3.
 Samaritanus (*adj.*; Menander) 50, 2.
 Samarites (*adj.*; Simon) 34, 2.
 Saturninus 28, 1.
 Simon 34, *passim*; 57, 7 (twice).
 Simonianus (*adj.*) 23, 1.
 Valentinus 12, 1; 23, 4.
 Valentiniani 18, 4; -us (*adj.*) 21, 1.

Heretic conceptions.

ΒΥΘΟΣ 12, 1.

ΣΙΓΗ 12, 1.

Sophia 11, 3; 23, 4.

Unigenitus 12, 1.

4. *Other authors* (for names only mentioned in anecdotes, etc., see 6).

Aegyptii (= Mercurius Aegyptius) 15, 5.

Antiphon 46, 10.

Artemon 46, 10.

Berenice maga 57, 10.

Callisthenes 46, 6.

Charon Lampsacenus 46, 4.

Cicero 24, 3.

Cratippus 46, 10.

Damigeron 57, 1.

Dardanus 57, 1.

Dionysius Rhodius 46, 10.

Ennius 33, 8.

Ephorus 46, 5.

Euphorion 46, 6.

Heraclides 57, 10.

Hermippus Berytensis 46, 10/1.

Hermotimus 2, 3.

Herodotus 46, 4 (twice), 49, 2; 57, 10.

Homerus 33, 8 (twice); 34, 1; 46, 2.

-icus (*adj.*) 56, 2 (twice).

Lucretius 5, 6.

Mercurius Aegyptius 2, 3; 28, 1; 33, 2.

Musaeus 2, 3.

Nectabis 57, 1.

Nicander 57, 10.

Nymphodorus 57, 10.

Orpheus 2, 3; 15, 5.

Ostanes 57, 1.

Philochorus Atheniensis 46, 10/1.

Sallustius 20, 3.

Serapion 46, 10.

Silenus Phryx 2, 3.

Strabo 46, 6.

Suetonius 44, 2.

Theopompus 44, 2.

Typhon 57, 1.

Vitellii commentarii 46, 7.

5. *Biblical and Christian names.*

Abraham 7, 4; 9, 8; 21, 4; 21, 5 (twice); 55, 2; 57, 11.

Adam 9, 8; 11, 4; 19, 6; 20, 6 (twice); 21, 1 (twice); 27, 7; 36, 4 (4 times); 38, 2; 40, 1; 43, 9; 43, 10 (twice); 45, 3; 55, 4.

Christianus: *subst.*: 2, 7; 3, 3; 6, 6; 15, 3; 26, 1; 55, 3; 57, 2; *adj.* 1, 5 (twice); 45, 1.

Christus 1, 4 (twice); 3, 3; 7, 3; 11, 4; 13, 3; 16, 3; 17, 13; 19, 9; 21, 2;

23, 2; 26, 4; 28, 1; 40, 1; 41, 3 (twice); 43, 10 (twice); 50, 3; 50, 4 (twice); 53, 5; 55, *passim*; 57, 12.

Cis 11, 5.

Daniel 48, 3/4.

David 15, 4.

Eleazarus 7, 2.

Elizabeth 26, 4.

Elymas 57, 7.

Enoch 50, 5.

Eva 36, 4; 38, 2.

Gerasenus 25, 8.

Helias 35, 5 (5 times); 35, 6 (3 times); 50, 5.

Hieremias 26, 5.

Iacob 50, 4.

Iohannes (Bapt.) 9, 3; 26, 4; 35, 5 (twice); 35, 6; 50, 4.

Iohannes (Evang.) 8, 5; 15, 4; 17, 14; 50, 5; 55, 4.

Israel 23, 3.

Iudas 11, 5.

Magdalena 25, 8.

Maria 26, 4.

Moses 35, 6; 37, 2; 57, 7; Moyses 28, 1; 57, 11.

Nabuchodonosor 47, 2.

Paulus 15, 4.

Perpetua 55, 4.

Petrus 17, 13.

Pharao 57, 7.

Pharisaei 16, 4.

Rebecca 26, 2.

Samuel 57, 8.

Saul 11, 5 (twice); 57, 8 (twice); 57, 9.

Thesbites (Helias) 35, 5.

Thomas 17, 14; 50, 5.

6. *Proper names belonging to pagan antiquity.*

Achilles 46, 9; 56, 2.

Aeacus 33, 9.

Aesculapius 1, 6.

Aethalides 28, 3; 31, 4.

Agaue 17, 9.

Ajax 17, 9; 46, 9.

Alemona 37, 1.

Alexander 46, 5; 50, 3.

Amphiaraus 46, 11.

Amphilochus 46, 11.

Anytus 1, 3.

Apicianus (*adj.*) 33, 4.

Archimedes 14, 4.

Aristodemus 46, 5.

Aristophon 46, 5.

Artorius 46, 8.

Astyages 46, 4.

Athamas 17, 9.

Augustus 46, 7.

Baralires Illyricus 46, 6.

Berenice 24, 5.
 Brutus 46, 8.
 Caesar (= Octavianus) 46, 8.
 Cassius 46, 8.
 Cebes 1, 6.
 Chilon Spartanus 52, 3.
 Cicero 46, 9 (Marcus Tullius 46, 7).
 Ciceronianus (*adj.*) 33, 4.
 Clidemus Atheniensis 52, 3.
 Clinias 20, 3.
 P. Crassus [instead of M. Crassus] 52, 3.
 Cyrus (*maior*) 46, 4.
 Cyrus (*minor*) 58, 5.
 Decima 37, 1.
 Diana 39, 2.
 Dido 33, 9.
 Dionysius 46, 6; 58, 5.
 Endymion: -es *Stoicorum* 55, 4.
 Epimenides 44, 2.
 Euphorbus 28, 3/4; 28, 5 (twice); 31, 3; 31, 4 (twice); 34, 1.
 Fata Scribunda 39, 2.
 Helena (Troiana) 34, 4 (twice); 34, 5 (twice).
 Hermione 46, 11.
 Hermotimus 28, 3; 31, 4; 43, 12; 44, 1 (twice); 44, 2; 44, 3.
 Iulius, s. Octavius.
 Iuno 39, 2.
 Iuppiter 46, 8.
 Laodice 46, 6.
 Leonymus 46, 9.
 Liber 25, 8.
 Lucina 37, 1; 39, 2.
 Lurconianus (*adj.*) 33, 4.
 Mandane 46, 4.
 Medea 50, 4.
 Megillus 20, 3.
 Melitus 1, 3.
 Menelaus 34, 5.
 Mercurius 53, 6.
 Midas 2, 3.
 Minerva 20, 3.
 Mithridates 46, 6.
 Mopsus 46, 11.
 Mucius (Scaevola) 58, 5.
 Neoptolemus tragoedus 46, 9.
 Nero 44, 2 (twice); 49, 2.
 Nestor 31, 6.
 Nona 37, 1.
 Octavius, Iulius 46, 7.
 Olympias 46, 5.
 Orestes 17, 9.
 Partula 37, 1.
 Pasiphae 46, 11.
 Patroclus 56, 2.
 Phaedo 1, 6.
 Philippus Macedo 46, 5.
 Polycrates Samius 46, 8.
 Priamus 34, 4.

Pyrrhus piscator 28, 3; 31, 4.
 Pythius (*adj.*) 1, 5.
 Samius (*adj.*) 28, 2.
 Sarpedon 46, 11.
 Saturnus 28, 1; 46, 10.
 Scipio 25, 8.
 Seleucus 46, 6.
 Sophocles 46, 9.
 Statina 39, 2.
 Stesichorus 34, 4.
 Sullanus (*adj.*) 33, 4.
 Temenidae 30, 2.
 Thetis 50, 3.
 Thrasymedes 44, 2; 49, 2.
 Trophonius 46, 11.
 Tullius, Marcus (= Cicero) 46, 7.
 Ulixes 17, 9.

7. *Geographical names.*

Aborigines 30, 2.
 Aegyptii 57, 7.
 Aetna 32, 1.
 Africa 30, 2.
 Alpes 25, 7.
 Arcadia 50, 3.
 Argaei (montes) 25, 7.
 Asia 30, 2; 46, 4 (3 times); 46, 6.
 Athenae 3, 1; 20, 3; 46, 9.
 Athenienses 30, 2.
 Atlantes 49, 2; 49, 3.
 Atticus (*adj.*) 6, 7.
 Boeotia 46, 11.
 Capherea saxa 52, 4.
 Celtae 57, 10.
 Cilicia 46, 11.
 Clazomenii 2, 3; *adj.* 44, 1.
 Colophon 50, 3.
 Colyttus 20, 3.
 Cretes 20, 3.
 Dalmatae 20, 3.
 Delphi 28, 4.
 Delphicus (*adj.*) 17, 12.
 Galilaea 17, 14.
 Germaniae 25, 7.
 Graeci 12, 1; 25, 6; 27, 5; 31, 6; -a quaedam 6, 8.
 Graecia 3, 3; 31, 4; 31, 5 (twice).
 Himeraea quaedam 46, 6.
 Indi 31, 6.
 Italia 30, 2; 31, 4.
 Iudaea 3, 3; 34, 4; 50, 3.
 Iudaei 35, 5.
 Laconica 46, 11.
 Libycus (*adj.*) 49, 2.
 Lyncestae 50, 3.
 Macedonia 46, 6; 46, 11.
 Mallus 46, 11.
 Mauri 20, 3.
 Medi 46, 4.
 Molossi 46, 6.

Nasamones 57, 10.
 Nonacris 50, 3.
 Olympia 52, 3.
 Oropus 46, 11.
 Parthicus (*adj.*) 30, 2.
 Peloponnesus 30, 2.
 Philippi 46, 8.
 Phoenices 30, 2.
 Phryges 20, 3; (= Troiani) 30, 2.
 Pontus 46, 6.
 Rhoeteum 46, 9.
 Romani 46, 7; -us (*adj.*) 25, 6; 37, 1.
 Samaria 34, 4.
 Sardinia 49, 2.
 Sarmatae 25, 7.
 Scythae 30, 2; 31, 6.
 Scythiae 25, 7.

Sicilia 46, 6.
 Stygius (*adj.*) 50, 3.
 Styx 50, 3 (twice); 50, 5.
 Telmessenses 46, 3.
 Thebae 20, 3.
 Troas 46, 11.
 Troia 34, 5 (twice); 46, 9.
 Troianus (*adj.*) 28, 5.

8. *Titles of books (only works of Plato).*

Leges 20, 3; 25, 9.
 Phaedo 18, 1; 23, 5; 54, 4.
 Phaedrus 17, 12 (twice).
 Politia 51, 2.
 Theaetetus 17, 12.
 Timaeus 17, 2; 20, 3; 23, 5.

II. INDEX OF QUOTATIONS FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE OCCURRING IN DE ANIMA

Literal quotations have been marked by an asterisk

Gen.	1, 26	27, 9*	Mtth.	12, 40	55, 1
	1, 28	27, 4*; 27, 9*		18, 25	16, 7
	2, 7	3, 4*; 26, 5*; 9, 7		16, 24	55, 5
	2, 16	38, 3*		17, 3 <i>seqq.</i>	17, 14
	2, 21	45, 3*		17, 12	35, 5*
	2, 21 <i>seqq.</i>	43, 9		22, 30	37, 4
	2, 23/4	11, 4*; 21, 2*		22, 32	26, 5*
	5, 24	50, 5		24, 24	57, 8*
	9, 3	38, 3*		(24, 36	33, 11)
	25, 22 <i>seqq.</i>	26, 2		26, 7/12	17, 13
	28, 12	50, 4		(26, 27/9	17, 13)
Exod.	7, 12	57, 7	Marc.	27, 52	55, 4
	21, 22	37, 2		5, 1 <i>seqq.</i>	25, 8
Num.	11, 17	35, 6		(8, 34	55, 5)
1 Reg.	10, 11	11, 5*		(13, 32	33, 11)
	28, 6 <i>seqq.</i>	57, 8		16, 9	25, 8
4 Reg.	2, 11	50, 5	Luc.	1, 17	35, 6*
Ps.	48, 12	32, 8*		1, 41	26, 4
	50, 12	15, 4*		1, 46	26, 4
	85, 13	55, 1		(6, 27	35, 2*)
Prov.	24, 12	15, 4		6, 43/4	21, 4
Sap.	1, 6	15, 4		9, 56	13, 3
Ies.	1, 22	3, 2		10, 18	17, 13
	42, 5	11, 3*		(12, 58/9	35, 2*; 35, 3)
	57, 16	11, 3*		14, 26	13, 3
Hier.	1, 5	26, 5* (twice)		(14, 27	55, 5)
	5, 21	9, 8		16, 19 <i>seqq.</i>	58, 1
Dan.	2, 1 <i>seq.</i>	47, 2		16, 22	55, 2
	2, 16 <i>seqq.</i>	48, 3		16, 22 <i>seqq.</i>	7, 1 <i>seqq.</i>
	10, 1 <i>seqq.</i>	48, 4		16, 30/1	57, 11
Ioel	2, 28	47, 2		22, 20	17, 13
Mal.	4, 5	35, 5*	Ioh.	1, 21	35, 5*
Mtth.	3, 7/9	21, 4		2, 1 <i>seqq.</i>	17, 14
	3, 17	17, 13		3, 5	39, 4*
	5, 25/6	35, 2*		3, 18	55, 2
		(35, 1/3); 58, 8		8, 44	16, 7*
	5, 28	15, 4*; 40, 4*; 58, 6*		10, 15 (11)	13, 3
	5, 44	35, 2*		19, 34	43, 10
	5, 45	47, 2		20, 24 <i>seqq.</i>	50, 5
	6, 21	57, 9		20, 27	17, 14
	6, 24	16, 7*		21, 23	50, 5
	8, 15	17, 13	Act. apost.	8, 9 <i>seqq.</i>	57, 7
	9, 4	15, 4*		8, 18 <i>seqq.</i>	34, 2
	10, 24	55, 2		13, 8 <i>seqq.</i>	57, 7
	10, 28	13, 3	Rom.	1, 20	18, 12*
	(10, 38	55, 5)		5, 14, 21	40, 1
	11, 14	35, 5*		10, 10	15, 4
				10, 18	49, 3
				13, 4	33, 6

1 Cor.	5, 10	35, 2	Coloss.	2, 8	3, 1
	6, 11	21, 4*	1 Thess.	4, 15/6	55, 3
	6, 19	53, 5	2 Thess.	2, 4	57, 8
	7, 14	39, 4*	1 Tim.	1, 4	2, 7
	11, 19	3, 1*		2, 13	36, 4
	15, 45	43, 10		3, 1	16, 6*
	15, 46	11, 3*	Tit.	1, 12	20, 3
2 Cor.	11, 14	57, 8*	(Hebr.	11, 5	50, 5)
Gal.	5, 12	16, 6*	1 Petr.	3, 19	55, 2
Ephes.	2, 3	16, 7*; 21, 4*	1 Ioh.	1, 1	17, 14*
	4, 9	55, 2		3, 20	15, 4
	(4, 13	56, 7)	Apoc.	6, 9	8, 5; 55, 4
	5, 8	21, 4*		11, 3	50, 5
	(5, 31/2	11, 4)		12, 10	35, 3

III. GENERAL INDEX

- Aborigines* 30, 2.
Abraham, interpretation of '—'s bosom' 7, *pr.*; 7, 4; 55, *pr.*; 55, 2.
Academy, Middle — on sense-perception 17, *pr.*; 17, 2.
Ἀγερούσια, λίμνη — 50, 3.
ἄγγαμοι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, 8.
Adam ∞ *Christ* 43, 10.
Aeacus, judge in hell 33, 9.
Aenesidemus I, 30*; ∞ *Heraclitus* 9, 5; 14, 5; 15, 5; 25, 2; on sense-perception 17, *pr.*; cf. also 18, 12.
Aëtius I, 30*.
affections of God 16, *pr.*; 16, 5; of *Christ* 16, *pr.*; 16, 4; of animals 16, 3; of man ch. 16.
Afferenda 39, 2.
Agave mentioned as instance of insanity 17, 9.
age, division of human life into 5 (4, 6, 7) -s 56, 6.
Agobardinus, *Codex* I, 1*.
Aiax mentioned as instance of insanity 17, 9.
Albinus, his work *Περὶ τῶν Πλάτωνι ἀρεσκόντων* used by *Tert.* I, 41*/4*; already used for *De Censu Animae* I, 44*; it is improbable that *Soranus* used his work I, 43*; data from his work used for *De anima* I, 43*/4*; on *Hermes Trismegistus* I, 47*; on *Ἀνάμνησις* 24, *pr.*; on *ἑναντία ἐξ ἑναντίων* 29, *pr.*
Alemona 37, 1.
Alexander, reports concerning his death 50, 3.
Alexander Philalethes I, 29*.
Ambrosius, apparently never used *De anima* I, 48*.
Amphiaraus, oracle of — 46, 11.
Amphilochus, oracle of — 46, 11.
amulets used by pregnant women 39, 2
Anacharsis, estimation of — in Greek philosophy and by *Tert.* 31, 6.
ἀνάμνησις, cf. s. v. 'recollection'.
Anastasius Sinaita, division of dreams 47, *pr.*
anatomy, aversion of μεθοδικοί against — 10, 4; 25, 5.
Anaxagoras on νοῦς 12, 2; criticized by *Aristotle* 12, 3; ὁψις ἀδήλων τὰ φαινόμενα 18, 12 (cf. B 21 a Diels); on sleep 43, 2; on sleep as διδασκαλία θανάτου 43, 12.
Anaximenes on the soul 9, 5.
Andreas (physician) I, 27*; 15, 2.
angels, fallen — regarded as *inventores artium* 2, 3; as authors of apocryphal books 2, 3; — taking care of children in the womb 37, 1; guides of souls after death 53, 6 (35, 3); *'conversari cum angelis'* 9, 4.
anger of God 16, 5; rational and irrational — 16, 6.
animals, estimation of minute — 10, 6; living on after removal of vital organs 15, 2; whether possessing affections or not 16, 3; habits of — 24, 5; — ∞ different types of men in doctrine of metempsychosis 32, 8.
Anonymus Darembergii sive Fuchsii I, 28*; 15, *pr.*
Anonymus Londiniensis I, 26*; 8, 3.
Antiphon on interpretation of dreams 46, 10.
Apelles, sources for the doctrine of — 23, 3; on the downfall of the soul 23, 3; on the sex of the soul 36, 3.
ἄφθοροι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, 8.
apocryphal books, composed by fallen angels 2, 3; drawn upon by pagan philosophers 2, 3.
Apollophanes, division of the soul 14, 2.
Archimedes, regarded as inventor of hydraulic organ 14, 4; his planetarium mentioned by Stoics in *argumentum ex creatione* 14, 4.
Aristotle, *'amicus Platonis'* 5, 1; estimation by *Tert.* 6, 7; I, 34*; his *minutiloquium* 6, 7; -is tenor 3, 3; data from his dialogues: *Silenus* 2, 3; *Hermotimus* (probably from *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*) 2, 3; (44, *pr.*, *ex.*); sleep of *Kronos* 46, 10; on νοῦς 12, *pr.*; 12, 3 (criticism of *Anaxagoras*: 12, 3); on αἰσθησις 12, 4; division of the soul 14, 2; avoids to speak of μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς 14, 3; on embryology 27, *pr.*; division of ἑναντία 29, 3; definition of change

- 32, 7; on the impossibility that two bodies should be in one and the same place 6, 8; on animals lacking respiratory organs 10, 2; on 'soul' of plants 19, *pr.* and 19, 2; on κατὰ φύσιν ∞ παρὰ φύσιν 43, 6; on hair ∞ brain 51, 3; on sleep 43, 2; on curious case of long sleep in Sardinia 49, 2; on prophetic dreams 46, 3; whether children dream or not 49, 1.
- Arius drawn upon by Soranus I, 38*/40*; data from his work probably used for *De anima* I, 40*; ∞ Sceptics I, 38*; cf. also 54, *pr.* and 54, 2.
- Arnobius never draws upon *De anima* I, 48*; on Plato's theory of recollection 24, *pr.*
- Artemidorus not drawn upon by Tert. and Hermippus 46, 10.
- Artemon (dream-interpreter) 46, 10.
- Asclepiades I, 23*; 15, 2.
- ἄταφοι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, *pr.*
- ἄτεκνοι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, 8.
- Athamas mentioned as instance of insanity 17, 9.
- Atharians described as loquacious 3, 1 (20, 3); as clever 20, 3.
- Atlantes thought never to dream 49, 2.
- Augustine I, 48*/9*; referring to *De anima* 9, 7; 37, 5; on minute animals 10, 6; on Plato's theory of recollection 24, *pr.*; on dreams 47, *pr.*
- autumn, insalubrious 48, 1.
- ἄωροι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, *pr.*; 57, 1.
- baptism, effects of — 41, 4; 'seal of faith' 41, 4; *negotium* between God and man or between devil and man 35, 3; 'reformatio' 41, 4; φωτισμός 41, 4; marriage of soul and Holy Spirit 41, 4; '— of blood' = martyrdom 43, 10; 55, 5; ∞ death 43, 12; Menander's — 50, 2.
- barbarians: estimation of — in Greek philosophy and by Tert. 6, 7 (31, 6; 49, 2).
- Basilides on metempsychosis 34, 1.
- Basilus, classification of dreams 47, *pr.*
- beans, influence of eating of — on dreams 48, 3; prohibition of — by Pythagoras 31, 4; 48, 3.
- Berenice (magician) 57, 1.
- Besnard, F. A. von, I., 4*.
- βιαιοθάνατοι, souls of — in the hereafter 56, *pr.* (57, *pr.*; 57, 1); Christians and Christ regarded as — 56, *pr.*; executed criminals most important part of — 56, 8.
- birth in 7th or 8th month of pregnancy 37, 4.
- birth-rites 39, 2/3.
- body, apparent increase in weight of — after death 8, 3; defined as *trifariam distantivum* 9, 1; relation of — and soul in sinning ch. 40, 41, 58; 'et ipsum homo' 51, 4; compared to ἀγγεῖον (*vas*) 9, 7; *calix* 40, 2; σκεῦος (*suppellex*) 40, 3; *scena* (σκηνή, σκήνος, σκηνώμα) 51, 3; house 38, 4 (38, 6).
- book of fate 37, 2; '— of the living' 37, 2.
- burning to death 1, 6.
- Caelius Aurelianus I, 26*; 15, *pr.*; 43, *pr.*; 44, 2.
- Carpocrates, sources for his doctrine 23, 2; on the origin of the soul 23, 2; on metempsychosis 35, *pr.*; interpretation of Matth. 5, 25/6: 35, 3.
- Cassiodorus I, 49*.
- catabolici spiritus* 28, 5.
- Censu, De — animae* I, ch. 3; 4, *pr.*; 4; 6, 3; 11, *pr.*; 22, 1/2; 24, *pr.*; 24, 2; 24, 10; I, 36*; *ib.*, 44*.
- Cerda, La, I, 3*/4*.
- Chalcidius on dreams 47, *pr.*
- chamaeleon, thought to live on air 32, 1.
- chance, pagan philosophers finding Truth by — 2, *pr.*; 2, 1.
- change, definitions of — 32, 7.
- charioteer, soul (mind) compared to — 53, 3 (45, 2).
- children, resemblance of — to their parents 5, 4; whether — can dream 49, 1; consecration of — to gods 39, 3.
- chiliasm 58, 8.
- Chilon: —'s death 52, 3.
- Christ: *deus et homo* 55, 2 (45, 3); reality of His body 17, 14; His affections 16, *pr.* and 16, 4; His descent to hell 55, *pr.*; never qualified as a martyr 50, 4; regarded as βιαιοθάνατος 56, *pr.*
- Christians, large number of — 15, 3 (49, 3); funeral rites of — 51, 6; — regarded as βιαιοθάνατοι 56, *pr.*
- chronology 28, 1.
- Chrysippus: '— *ad helleborum*' 6, 8; on the corporeality of the soul 5, 6; division of the soul 14, 2; on the seat of the ἡγεμονικόν 15, *pr.*; 15, 4.
- Chrysippus (physician) 15, 6.
- Cicero I, 46*; 17, *pr.*; 17, 11; 20, 3; 24, 3.
- Cleanthes 5, 4/5.
- Clidemus: —' death 52, 3.

- climate, influence of — on mind and character 20, 3; 25, 7.
 cohabitation, estimation of — 27, 4.
 colour of the soul 9, *pr.*
 Colyttus 20, 3.
 common sense 2, 1; 9, 5, 7; 13, *pr.*; 13, 2; 46, *pr.*; 48, 2; 49, 1.
 conception 27, *pr.*; in astrology 25, 9.
concordia discors 8, 1.
 contrasts, classification of — (Aristotle, Strato, Albinus, Olympiodorus) 29, 3/4.
 Crassus: —' death 52, 3.
 Cratippus on dreams 46, 10.
 creationism 26, *pr.*
 cremation of the dead forbidden to Christians 51, 4; after executions 33, 5.
 Cretans regarded as mendacious 20, 3.
 Critolaus 5, 1.
 curtain in theatre 41, 4.
 Cyprian never draws on *De anima* I, 48*.
 Dalmatians, character of — 20, 3.
 Damigeron (magician) 57, 1.
 Daniel, his 'ecstasy' 48, 3/4.
 Dardanus (magician) 57, 1.
 date of *De anima* I, ch. 2.
 death, ch. 50/3; various kinds of — 52, 1; — always violent according to Tert. 52, 3 — -blow 33, 5.
 decalogue, symbolic interpretation of — 37, 4.
Decima 37, 1.
Deferenda, etc. 39, 2.
 definition of body 9, 1; of man 17, 11; of change 32, 7.
 delivery in terra 19, 7.
 Democritus frequently drawn upon by Soranus I, 27*; 2, 6; on philosophy ~ medicine 2, 6; on νοῦς 12, 6; on ἡγεμονικόν 15, 3; argument against the view that ἡγ. situated in the head 15, 2; on sleep 43, 2; on death (Περὶ τῶν ἐν ᾧ αὐτοῦ) 51, 2; 'Pseudo-democritean' literature 24, 5.
 demons, free up to Last Judgment 46, 13; receiving human soul at birth 39, 1 (40, 1); influence on oracles 46, 12 (1, 5); 'hiding behind the images of pagan gods' 57, 5; sending illness and then again curing it 46, 12; entering human bodies 11, 5; activity in general 46, 12; exorcized 57, 5; relation to devil 57, 2; souls of — 25, 8; *daemones catabolici* 28, 5; *d. paredri* 28, 5; *d. pythonici* 28, 5; δαίμων = νοῦς 12, 1; Socrates' δαιμόνιον 1, 5 (39, 3).
 descent of Christ, various views on — 55, *pr.*; — of Pythagoras, cf. s. v. 'Pythagoras'.
 desire, whether there exists rational — s 16, *pr.*; 16, 6; — of food the only natural — 38, 3.
 Devil, qualified as *adversarius* 35, 3; *aemulus* 20, 5 (39, 1); *artifex erroris* 1, 5; *auceps* 39, 1; *criminator* 35, 3; *delator* 35, 3; 'invited' by pagan birth-rites 39, 1; always 'spying' 35, 3; receiving human soul at birth 39, 1; 40, 1; '*summa daemonum*' 57, 2; cf. also ch. 16 and 41, 1.
dialectici, estimation of — 43, 6.
 Dicaearchus 15, 2.
 Dido in apologetic literature 33, 9.
dies lustricus 39, 2.
 Diels I, 21*.
 Diocles I, 27*; on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, 3; on sense-perception 17, 2.
 Dionysius of Rhodus (?) 46, 10.
 Dionysus, birth of — 25, 8.
dioptra 25, 5.
 disasters, enumerations of — 30, 4; regarded as a remedy against overpopulation 30, 4.
discordia concors 8, 1.
 'discretion of spirits' 9, 4.
 disposition frequently emphasized by Tert. 25, 1.
 double names 31, 3.
 dream, ch. 45/9; definition of — 45, *pr.* and 45, 2; classification of — s 47, *pr.*; —s received at the end of the night and in spring more trustworthy 48, 1; — oracles 46, 11; — interpreters 46, 10; list of 14 famous —s 46, 4/9; estimation of *somnia Venerea* 45, 4; —s source of knowledge of God 47, 2; activity of the soul in —s 43, 12; 45, 1/2; whether children dream or not 49, 1; gates of dreams 46, 2; see also I, 44*/5*.
 eagle, vigour of its eyes 8, 4; in metempsychosis 32, 6.
ecstasi, *De*, date of — I, 5*.
 ecstasy, various views on — 11, 5; 45, *pr.*; — of Adam 11, 4; of Daniel 48, 3/4.
 eight: symbolic interpretation of number — 37, 4; on children born in the —th month of pregnancy 37, 4.
 Elias: his *translatio* 50, 5 (35, 6); St. John the Baptist regarded as his reincarnation 35, 5.
 embryo regarded as a ζῶον 27, *pr.* (25, *pr.*); as *homo* 37, 2.
 embryology, views concerning — of Aristotle, the Stoics, Soranus, Tert. and other Christian authors 27, *pr.* ἐμβρυολικός, ἐμβρυοθάλασσης, ἐμβρυο-

- σφάκτης, ἐμβροστόμος 25, 5.
 Empedocles: -is *furor* 3, 3; on νεῖκος and φίλη 8, 1; on the seat of the soul 15, 5 (20, 3); on sense-perception 17, 2; on metempsychosis 32, *pr.*; on sleep 43, 2; ridiculized by the Cynics, Lucianus, and Tert. 32, 1.
 Endymion: Varro's — *es* 55, 4; 'minion' 55, 4.
 Ennius: his *Epicharmus* quoted by Tert. 18, 1; the *prooemium* of the *Annales* alluded to by Tert. 28, 2 (?); 33, *pr.*; 33, 8.
 Enoch: his *translatio* 50, 5 (35, 6); book of — 2, 3.
 Epicharmus regarded as an authority on dreams 46, 10 (47, 3).
 Epicurus: -i *stupor* 3, 3; Tert. quoting the κύρια δόξαι 42, 1; 46, 2; on sense-perception 17, *pr.*; 17, 4; 17, 6; 17, 9; on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, 5 (15, 2); on death 42, 1; on sleep 43, 2; on dreams 46, 2; on desire 38, 3; senses necessary to human life 17, 11; view about the soul's leaving the body 53, *pr.*
 Epimenides mentioned in 'miracle-books' 44, 2; his sleep 44, 2.
Epistula de castitate, imitations of passages from *De anima* in —: 25, 5; 30, 4; 47, 2; I, 48*.
 Erasistratus on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, 5.
 errors of Tert. in *De anima*: 15, 5; 15, 6; 28, 1; 28, 4; 39, 2; 44, 2; 46, 5; 46, 9; 46, 10; 48, 2; 49, 3; 52, 3; 54, 1; 54, 2; 54, 3; 54, 4.
 eschatology ch. 54/8.
 Esser I, 21*.
 Eubulus 5, 1.
 euphemism (in sexual matters) 38, 2.
 Euphorbus, shield of — 28, 5.
 executions, estimation of — 56, 8.
 exorcism 57, 5.
 eye: '— of the soul' 57, 6; 'oculi lenones' 38, 2.
 falsification of Old Testament by pagan philosophers 2, 4.
 farmer, and soldier, quoted as instances of every-day life 13, 2.
 fasting ∞ *incubatio* 48, 3.
Fata Scribunda 39, 2.
 Fate: *fatum* ∞ *fortuna* ∞ *providentia* 20, 5; Tert.'s treatise on Fate I, 5*; 20, 5.
 fig-leaves symbol of *concupiscentia* 38, 2.
 fishermen, denomination of Christians 3, 3.
fons animarum 20, 6.
Fuldense, fragmentum, its authenticity proved by 28, 1; 28, 1.
 Fulgentius imitating passages from *De anima*: 6, 7; 32, 3; 46, 10.
 Gagneius I, 2*.
 gates of dreams 46, 2.
 Gelenius I, 2*.
 Genoude, de, I, 0.
 gladiator, souls of —s conjured up by necromancers 57, 5.
 glory, thirst for — of pagan philosophers 1, 2.
 Gnostics, systems of — compared to mythological stories 23, 4.
 goat immune to poison 32, 6.
 Gods, pagan — = *mortui* 57, 2.
 grace, divine 9, 3; 21, 6.
 Gregory of Elvira imitating passages from *De anima* 7, *pr.*; 27, 4 (55, 5: from *De resurr. carnis*).
 Gregory of Nyssa, on dreams 47, *pr.*
 Gregory the Great, classification of dreams 47, *pr.*
 growth and decrease of the soul 37, 5.
gymnosophistae, estimation of — 31, 6.
 gynaecological instruments 25, 5.
 habit 'second nature' 16, 1; 41, 1.
 hair, offerings of — 39, 3; growth of hair in dead bodies 51, 2/3.
 harrier, rapacity of — 32, 8.
 Harrisius I, 3*.
 heart, 'shrine of the body' 15, 3; arguments for the thesis that the mind is situated in the — 15, 4; animals living on after removal of — 15, 2.
 heaven open to martyrs only 55, *pr.*
hebdomas, symbolic interpretation of — 37, 4.
 ἡγεμονικόν, ch. 15 (especially 15, *pr.*); Latin translations of — 15, 1.
 hell, all souls, except those of martyrs, stay in — up to Last Judgment 55, *pr.*; Christ's descent into — 55, *pr.*
 helleborus 6, 8.
 helmsman, soul (mind, God) compared to — 52, 4.
 Heraclides Ponticus on the soul 9, 5; on Pythagoras' reincarnations 28, 3.
 Heraclitus, ὁ σκωτεινός 2, 6; -i *maior* 3, 2; cf. s. v. 'Aenesidemus'.
 hereditary sin 16, *pr.*; 41, *pr.*
 heretics, drawing on Greek philosophers 3, *pr.*; 3, 1; on sense-perception 17, *pr.*; 17, 1.
 Hermetic literature I, 47*; 2, 3; 15, *pr.*; 15, 5 (28, 1); 33, 2.
 Hermione, oracle of — 46, 11.
 Hermippus of Berytus I, 44*/5*; 44, *pr.*; 46, *pr.*; 46, 10.
 Hermippus of Smyrna 28, 2.

- Hermogenes I, ch. 3; 11, 2; 21, 6/7; 24, 2; 24, 10.
- Hermotimus 2, 3; 44, *pr.*
- Herodotus, quotations from — by Christian authors 46, 4; used by Hermippus of Berytus 46, 4; 49, *pr.*; 49, 1; 57, 10.
- Herophilus 10, 4; 15, 5; 25, 5; 47, *pr.*
- Hicesius 25, 2.
- Hieronimus, imitation of passages from *De anima* by —: *epist.* 12, 2; 3, 3; 22, 19, 2; 38, 2; 60, 4, 2; 1, 2; 60, 8, 2; 40, 1; 60, 12, 1; 10, 6 and 32, 3; 64, 1, 3; 15, 4; 65, 19, 5; 25, 3; 66, 8, 3; 1, 2; 85, 5, 1; 39, 4; 100, 9, 1; 1, 6; 118, 5, 2; 1, 2; 129, 2, 1; 55, 5; 130, 7, 14; 35, 3; 133, 2, 1; 3, 1; *Adv. Helvid.* 21: 30, 4; *Adv. Iovin.* 1, 36; 27, 6; *Adv. Rufin.* 1, 31; 45, 4; *Comm. in Ps.* 9: 35, 3; *tract. de Ps.* 91: 10, 5; 10, 6; *Comm. in Naum* 3, 16 *seq.*: 3, 1; in *epist. ad Galat.* 1, 4; 40, 2; *ib.* 3, 1; 20, 3; 25, 7; *ib.* 4, 19; 27, 4; *de Exod. in vigil. Pasch.* (Anecd. Mareds. III, 2: 410, 8): 26, 3; *homil. Orig. in Ezech.* 13: 14, 3; — on usefulness of minute animals 10, 6.
- Hilarius never uses *De anima* I, 48*.
- Hipparchus wrongly mentioned instead of Hippasus 5, 2.
- Hippasus on the soul 5, 2.
- Hippo on the soul 5, 2.
- Homer, Tert.'s estimation of — 33, 8.
- Homosexuality, pagan philosophers reproached with — 1, 6 (54, 2).
- hydraulic organ mentioned in metaphors 14, 4.
- idea* 18, 3; *ἰδέα* = thoughts of God 43, 11.
- idolatry ∞ magic 57, 2; — at the root of all sins and errors 57, 2.
- Imitation 34, *pr.*
- incubo* (-us) 44, 2.
- infulae*, worn by pregnant women 39, 2.
- insanity 17, 9; 18, 9.
- instruction of souls in the hereafter 54, 3; — of *iusti*, etc. by Christ during His descent into hell 55, *pr.*; 55, 2.
- interrment, refusal of — 33, 5.
- interpretation of passages from Holy Scripture:
- Gen. 1, 28; 27, 4.
2, 7: I, 10*; 9, 7; 36, 4.
2, 21 *seqq.*: 11, 4 (21, 2); 45, *pr.*
3, 7: 38, 2.
25, 22 *seq.*: 26, 2.
28, 12: 50, 4.
- Exod. 7, 12; 57, 7.
21, 22/3: 26, *pr.*; 37, 2.
- I Reg. 28, 6 *seqq.*: 57, 8.
- Ps. 48, 13: 32, 8.
- Ies. 1, 22: 3, 1.
42, 5: 11, 3.
57, 16: 11, 3.
- Hier. 1, 5: 26, *pr.*; 26, 5.
- Matth. 5, 25/6: 35, 2/3; 58, 8.
13, 25: 16, 7.
17, 12: 35, 5.
25, 1 *seqq.*: 18, 4.
- Luc. 1, 41. 46: 26, 4.
6, 43: 21, 4.
16, 19 *seqq.*: 7, *pr.*; 7, 2; 57, 11.
- Joh. 19, 34: 43, 10.
21, 23: 50, 5.
- Rom. 7, 22: 9, 8.
11, 17/24: 21, 5.
- I Cor. 7, 12: 39, 4.
11, 19: 3, 1.
15, 45: 43, 10.
- Gal. 5, 12: 16, 6.
- Ephes. 4, 9: 55, *pr.*
4, 13: 56, 7.
5, 31/2: 11, 4.
- 1 Tim. 1, 4: 2, 7.
- 1 Joh. 1, 1: 17, 14.
- Apoc. 6, 9: 9, 8 (8, 5).
11, 3: 50, 5.
- invisibility of the soul regarded as a proof of its incorporeality 8, 4.
- Irenaeus, drawn upon by Tert. I, 45*/6*; 11, *pr.*; 18, *pr.*; 18, 3; 21, *pr.*; 23, *pr.*; 34, *pr.*; 35, *pr.*; 37, 4; 38, 2; 50, *pr.*; 55, *pr.* on ἀνάμνησις 24, *pr.*
- Isidorus (son of Basilides), his view about ἐπιθυμία 38, 3.
- Iuno, *mensa* -nis 39, 2.
- ivy, described as a living being 19, 5.
- jail, darkness of — 1, 6; 'carcer otiosus' 33, 7.
- John the Baptist regarded as reincarnation of Elias 35, 5.
- John the Evangelist regarded as immortal 50, 5.
- judgment after death 33, *pr.*; 33, 1.
- Julianus of Alexandria I, 49*.
- Junius, Franc., I, 3* and 4*.
- just, whether set free from hell by Christ's descent 55, *pr.*
- Justin, his Σύνταγμα not used by Tert. in ch. 34/5, 34, *pr.* (cf. also 50, *pr.*).
- καπηλεύειν μάθησιν, etc. 3, 1.
- Karpp, H., I, 21*.
- κελητίζειν 34, 4.
- Kellner, H., I, 4*.
- Κοσμοκράτωρ 23, 2.
- Kronos, sleep of —, 46, 10.
- Lactantius on dreams 47, *pr.*; on death

53, *pr.* never draws upon *De anima* I, 48*.
lapathus 32, 2.
 Lazarus, interpretation of the story (or parable?) of — 7, *pr.*; 7, 2.
 Leopardus, Paulus, I, 3*.
 Leopold I, 3*.
 Lindner I, 4*.
 lion always retaining the *scientia naturalium* 24, 5; in metempsychosis 32, 6; thought to have no more than one cub 46, 5.
 liver, importance of — for dreams 48, 2.
Lucina 37, 1; 39, 2.
 Lucretius I, 46*; 5, 6; 17, *pr.*; 17, 4; 17, 5; 19, 8; 24, *pr.*; 51, 5; 53, *pr.*; 58, 4.
lustricus dies 39, 2.
 magic qualified as *secunda idololatria* 57, 2.
 manuscripts, originally four collections of — of Tert. I, 1*.
 Marcion, polemics against — 7, *pr.*; 7, 4; 8, 1; 10, *pr.*; 10, 6; 16, *pr.*; 16, 5; 17, 14; 18, 10; 21, 4; 21, 6; 23, 2; 27, 4; 35, 4; 43, 10; 55, *pr.*; 55, 2/3; a reminiscence from —'s redaction of the New Testament? 55, 3; *Adversus* —, date of — I, 5*.
 marriage of soul and Holy Spirit at baptism 41, 4.
 martyrs, fate of — in the hereafter 9, 8 (8, 5); 55, *pr.*; 55, 4; regarded as *βιζιοθάνατοι* 56, *pr.* and 56, 8; — martyrdom qualified as 'baptism of blood' 43, 10; compared to suffering from illness 55, 5; regarded as superfluous by various heretics 50, 4.
Masburensis, Codex, I, 2*.
mater ecclesia 43, 10.
Mauri, character of — 20, 3.
 Melito, his work *De sensibus* 17, *pr.* memory, qualifications of — 24, 3.
 Menander, sources for his doctrine 50, *pr.*; his baptism 50, *pr.* and 50, 2.
 Menander (the poet) 50, 4.
 Meno (pupil of Aristotle) I, 29*.
mensa Iunonis 39, 2.
 Mesnartius I, 2*.
 metempsychosis, problems connected with —: prefaces to ch. 29/33.
 'methodical' school of physicians I, 22*/5*.
 Methodius 29, *pr.*; 43, 12.
 Meyboom I, 4*.
 Migne I, 3*.
 migrations of nations, described in Varro's *Antiquitates humanae* 30, 2.
 millennium 58, 8.

'miracle-books' I, 47*; 2, *pr.*; 2, 3; 28, 5; 44, *pr.*; 46, 10; 49, 2; 52, *pr.*
 Montanism, divine service 9, 4; revelations 9, 4; 48, 4; ecstasy 11, 4; dreams 45, *pr.*; 47, *pr.*; revelations 'extorted' from God by fasting 48, 4; eschatology 58, 8.
 Mopsus, oracle of — 46, 11.
 Moschion 15, 5.
 Moses considered a prophet 28, 1; his importance for Christ. chronology 28, 1.
 Mucius Scaevola mentioned in apologetic literature 58, 5.
 Musaeus 2, 3.
 nails, growth of — in dead bodies 51, 2/3.
 names not immediately mentioned 28, 2 (*Samius sophista... ille Pythagoras*; 14, 4; 39, 1; 49, 2; 57, 1) double — 31, 3; cf. also Ind. IV s. v. *nomen*.
 necromancy 57, 3.
 Nectabis (= Nectanebus) 57, 1.
Nona 37, 1.
 nonchalance, studied 9, 4 (*nescio quid*); 15, 5; 34, 1; 46, 5; 57, 10.
 Novatianus never draws upon *De anima* I, 48*.
 Number, importance of — in polemics 14, 2 (progression of numbers in doxographical survey); 5, 1; 15, 3; — of souls 30, *pr.*
occupatio (refutation of a view which might crop up) 35, 5; 55, *pr.*; 56, 8.
 Oehler, Franc., I, 3* and 4*.
ogdoas symbol of *vita futura* 37, 4.
 Olympiodorus on Plato's theory of recollection 24, *pr.*; on 'ἐναντία ἐξ ἐναντίων' 29, 3/4.
 oracles controlled by demons 46, 12 (1, 5).
 Orestes mentioned as instance of insanity 17, 9.
 Origenes on the downfall of the soul 25, 6; on instruction of souls in the hereafter 54, 3.
 [Origenes] *Tractat. de script. sacra*, cf. s. v. 'Gregory of Elvira'.
 Orpheus 2, 3; 15, 5.
 Ostanes 57, 1.
 owl unable to see the sun 8, 4.
palio, De — I, 6*; 17, 3; 30, 2; 30, 3; 30, 4 (*tonsura*); 33, 5.
 Pamelius I, 3* and 4*.
 Panaetius, division of the soul 14, 2.
 parable: Luc. 16 (Lazarus) a real story or a —? 7, *pr.*; 7, 2.
paracletus 55, 5; 58, 8 (9, 3).
 paradise, situation of — according to Tert. 55, *pr.*

- paredri spiritus* 28, 5 (1, 5; 39, 3).
 Parmenides on sleep 43, 2.
Partula 37, 1.
 Pasiphae, oracle of — 46, 11.
Passio Perpetuae, whether consulted by Tert. or not 55, 4.
 patriarchs, whether set free from hell by Christ's descent 55, *pr.*
 Peripatetics on affections of animals 16, 3.
 Perpetua, martyrdom of — I, 5*.
 Persecution by Scapula I, 6*.
 Pherecydes on metempsychosis 2, 3; mentioned in 'miracle-books' 2, 3; regarded as a magician 28, 5.
 Philo I, 14*; 14, 2; 43, 12; 45, *pr.*; 47, *pr.*
 Philochorus on dreams 46, 10.
 philosophers sometimes found Truth by chance or through common sense 2, 1; drawing upon Orpheus, etc. 2, 3; upon apocryphal books 2, 3; upon the Old Testament (which they corrupted) 2, 4; put on a level with poets 1, 4; reproached with homosexuality 1, 6 (54, 2); qualified as *patriarchae haereticorum* 3, 1.
 philosophy ~ medicine 2, 6.
 Philumena 36, 3.
 Phrygians qualified as cowards 20, 3.
 phthisis, influence of — on the mind 20, 4.
 pigeon qualified as chaste 32, 8.
 plagiarism from the Old Testament by pagan philosophers 2, 4.
 plants, views of Aristotle, the Stoics, and Tert. about the life of — 19, *pr.*; 19, 2; 19, 4.
 Plato, data concerning — in *De anima* mostly taken from Albinus I, 41*/4*; enumeration of the most important of these data I, 41*; estimation of — by Tert. 3, 2 (*-nis honor*); his *eloquium* 6, 7; Socrates' dream about him 46, 9; his death 52, 3; cf. (except the passages quoted in the Introduction) 8, 4 (invisibility of the soul); 20, 6 (*fons animarum*); 30, *pr.* (constant number of souls).
 Platonist, A Christian — drawn upon by Tert.? I, 46*.
 Pliny, his *Naturalis historia* drawn upon by Tert.: I, 46*; 9, 6; 10, *pr.*; 10, 6; 19, 8; 24, *pr.*; 24, 5; 25, 7; 32, 2; 32, 3; 32, 5; 32, 6; 33, *pr.*; 50, 3.
 'Pneumatic' school of physicians I, 25*; on embryology 27, *pr.*
 poets put on a level with philosophers 1, 4; said to change into swans 33, 9;
licentia -arum 57, 12.
 Posidonius, division of the soul 14, 2; avoids speaking of μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς 14, 3; mentioned the hydraulic organ in comparisons? 14, 4; classification of prophetic dreams 47, *pr.*; whether he discussed the ἄωροι and βαιοθάνατοι 56, *pr.*
 Praxagoras on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, *pr.*
 prayers, division of — by Tert. 9, 4.
 presbyter, whether Tert. held the function of — in the community of the Montanists 9, 4.
 preaching in divine service 9, 4.
 Priorius I, 3*.
 prophecy, whether possible after John the Baptist 9, 3; examination of -ies 9, 4 (15, 4); noting down of -ies 9, 4; -ies on death-bed 53, 5.
 prophets, whether set free from hell by Christ's descent 55, *pr.*; Moses regarded as the first — 28, 1 (and Holy Scripture as *prophetica paratura* 2, 3, 4).
 Providence, its relation to fate 20, 5.
 Prudentius probably influenced by Tert. I, 48*; 47, *pr.*
 Psalms, singing of — 9, 4.
 ψυχή derived from ψύχος 25, 6 (27, 5).
 puberty 38, 1/2.
 puns: *urbis-orbis* 1, 6; *dicere-docere* 2, 2; *divinitas-divinatio* 38, 1; *censu-recensentur* 31, 5; *ornare-onerare* 33, 8; *mundus-immundus* 40, 1; cf. also Ind. IV s. v. 'Ambiguity'.
 puppets, relation of soul to body compared with movement of — 6, 3.
 Purgatory 58, 8.
 Pythagoras, his descent to hell 28, 2; his reincarnations 28, 3; the shield of Euphorbus 28, 4.
 Pythagoreans on number of souls 30, *pr.*; prohibition of fish 31, 4; of beans 31, 4; 48, 3; whether they discussed the fate of ἄωροι and βαιοθάνατοι in the hereafter 56, *pr.*
pythonici spiritus 28, 5.
quaestiones (in)finitae 2, 7.
 quail, immune to poison 32, 6.
 quintuplets 6, 8.
 recollection, Plato's theory of — ch. 24 (especially 24, *pr.*).
refrigerium 33, 11.
 Reifferscheid, Aug., I, 4*.
 resurrection ~ metempsychosis I, 43*; 29, *pr.*; 32, *pr.*; 33, 11; moment of — unknown to everybody 33, 11; symbolized by awakening after sleep 43, 12; 'first —' 35, 3; 58, 8 (37, 4); case of Hermotimus might endanger the dogma of — 44, *pr.* Date of

De — ne carnis I, 5*.
 Rigaltius I, 3* and 4*.
 Salamander not harmed by fire 32, 3.
 Saliva-superstition 50, 2.
 Sallust I, 47* (20, 3).
 Sarmates '*etiam mente torpentes*' 25, 7.
 Sarpedon, oracle of — 46, 11.
 Saturninus, sources for his psychology 23, 1.
 Scapula, persecution by — I, 6*.
 Sceptics ∞ μεθοδικοί I, 30*; influence of — philosophy in *De anima* 2, *pr.*; 2, 6; 3, 1; 3, 2; 5, 1; 8, 4; 9, 5; 10, *pr.*; 10, 9; 14, 2; 14, 5; 15, *pr.*; 17, *pr.*; 17, 3. 6. 9. 11; 32, 4.
 Scipio, birth of — 25, 8.
 Scripture, Holy, reading of — 9, 4; cf. s. v. 'interpretation'.
 Semler, J. B., I, 3*.
 Seneca I, 46*; 19, 8; 20, *pr.*; 20, 1; 29, 3; 42, 2; 53, 4.
 sense-perception ch. 17 (especially 17, *pr.*); senses necessary to human life 17, 11; compared to windows 14, 5; illusion of senses 17, 2 *seqq.*
 Serapion (dream-interpreter) 46, 10.
 service, divine, order of — 9, 4; whether Tert. describes a Catholic or a Montanistic — 9, 4.
 seven, symbolic interpretation of number — 37, 4.
 sex of the soul 36, *pr.*
 sheep: '*proba ovis*' 32, 8.
 shipwreck mentioned in comparisons 52, 4.
 Silenus, story of — 2, 3.
 Simon, sources for his doctrine 34, *pr.* *Simoniani* 57, 7.
 sin 16, *pr.*; 39, 4; 41, 1; enumeration of — s 40, 3; distinction of original — and — caused by the devil 40, 1; 41, 1.
 singing, cf. s. v. 'Psalms'.
 sleep, ch. 43; image of death 42, 3; ∞ resurrection 43, 12; panegyrics of sleep 43, 7; — of Kronos 46, 10.
 snake, coldness of — 32, 3.
 Socrates, estimation of — by Tert. 1, *pr.*; his δαιμόνιον a δαίμων πάρεδρος 1, 5 (39, 3); his offering of a cock 1, 6; the formula of his condemnation I, 6; on the νοῦς (?) 12, 1.
 soldier, cf. s. v. 'farmer'.
 sophisms 6, 2. 3. 5; 7, 4; 24, 4. 7; 27, *pr.*; 31, *pr.*; 42, 1.
 Soranus, his life I, 25*; interest in the history of medicine I, 26*; in etymology I, 27*; in exact classifications 14, *pr.*; 14, 5; propensity to polemical discussions I, 26*; how far adhering to the doctrine of the

'methodical' school I, 26*; influence of the Sceptics on — I, 30*; aversion from surgery and vivisection I, 28*; 10, 4 (25, 5); authors usually quoted by him I, 26*/7*; predilection for Democritus I, 27*; Works: Αἰτιολογούμενα I, 28*; 15, *pr.*; Βίαι ἱατρῶν, etc. I, 26*; Π. ὁξ. κ. χρόν. παθ. I, 26*; Π. ἐτυμολ. τ. σωμ. I, 27*; Γυναικεία I, 27*; Π. σπέρμ. I, 27*; subjects discussed in Π. ψυχῆς I, 31*/2*; authorities used in Π. ψυχῆς: Aenesidemus I, 30*; Arius I, 38* (not Albinus: I, 43); doxographical material in *De anima* taken from Π. ψυχῆς I, 33*/4*; other parts harking back to Π. ψυχῆς I, 34*/7*; — Views of Soranus: on apparent increase in weight of dead bodies 8, 3; on the parts of the soul 14, 2; on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, *pr.*; on sense-perception 17, *pr.*; on the soul of the embryo 25, *pr.*; 37, 2; 37, 5; on embryology 27, *pr.*; on the growth of the soul 37, 5; on the ἐφιάλης (*incubo*) 44, *pr.* and 44, 2; on sleep, 43, *pr.*
 soul: subjects concerning the — may easily be found with the help of the 'Analysis' (pp. 15*/20*).
 south: people from southern countries regarded as clever 25, 7.
 sperm 27, *pr.*; compared to foam 27, 5.
 Spirit, Holy — ∞ baptism 41, 4; cf. also s. v. '*paracletus*'.
 spiritus, different meanings of — 11, *pr.*
 Stati(*li*)na 39, 2.
 Stesichorus, —' palinode 34, 4.
 Stoics (cf. also s. vv. 'Chrysippus', 'Cleanthes', 'Zeno'): on θεόλογοι ἄνδρες (e. g. Orpheus) 2, 3; philosophy ∞ medicine 2, 6; μίξις 6, 8; corporeality of τέχνη, etc. 6, 7; corporeality of everything 7, 3; (in)visibility of the soul 8, 4; identity of soul and life-breath 10, *pr.*; usefulness of minute animals 10, 6; division of the soul 14, 2; comparisons illustrating the relation of soul to body 14, 4; the ἡγεμονικόν 15, 3; affections of animals 16, 3; sense-perception 17, *pr.* 4. 5; illusions of the senses 17, 6; definition of man 17, 11; souls of children 19, *pr.*; 'souls' of plants 19, *pr.*; soul of embryo 25, 2; embryology 27, *pr.*; metempsychosis 30, *pr.*; desire (of food) 38, 3; sleep 43, 2; dream 45, *pr.*; prophetic dreams

- 46, 11; *divinatio naturalis* 46, 11; classification of dreams 47, *pr.*; eschatology 54, 1/3.
- stoutness, influence of — on mind 20, 4.
- Strato: on ἡγεμονικόν 15, 5; ἀνάμνησις 24, *pr.*; ἐναντία 29, 3; sleep 43, 2; dreams 46, 10.
- Strato (pupil of Erasistratus) on ἡγεμονικόν 15, 5.
- Styx, water of — making immortal 50, 3; ∞ baptism of Menander 50, 3. *substantia* 9, 6; 32, 8.
- Suetonius I, 47*; 44, 2.
- surgery, estimation of — 10, 4 (25, 5).
- swallow, garrulous 32, 8.
- swan, -song 33, 9; poets thought to change into —s 33, 9.
- sylogisms, incomplete: 9, 5; 14, 3; 25, 4; 29, 1; 29, 2; 38, 5; 42, 2; 43, 7; abundant: 6, 1; 7, 4; 10, 7; 14, 1; 17, 8; 21, 1; 25, 8; 56, 4; confused: 4, 6, 1/2; 7, *pr.*; 10, 7; 12, 3; 18, 10; 21, 3; 27, *pr.*; 43, 3; 50, 4.
- Tatianus, influence of — on Tert. 2, 4; 8, 5 (11, *pr.*); 20, 5; 28, 1.
- Telmessus, divination at —, 46, 3.
- ten, symbolic interpretation of number — 37, 3.
- Testament, Old —, cf. s. v. 'plagiarism'.
- testimonium ex aemulo* 2, 5; — *animae* 41, 3.
- Thales on the soul 5, 2; — *in puteum* 6, 8.
- Thebans, stupidity of the — 20, 3.
- Thelwall and Holmes, I, 4*.
- Themiso I, 23*.
- Theophilus drawn upon in the *frag. Fuldense* 28, 1; combated Her-mogenes I, 8*.
- Theophrastus, Φυσ. δόξ., I, 29*.
- Theopompus I, 47*; 2, 3; 44, 2.
- tollere infantem* 19, 7.
- traducianism 19, 6; 27, *pr.*; 36, 4; 40, 1.
- Trecensis, Codex* I, 1*.
- Trophonius, oracle of — 46, 11.
- Truth, '*veritas perosa*' 1, 6; both old and young according to Tert. 28, 3.
- Typhon (magician) 57, 1.
- Ursinus, Fulv., I, 4*.
- Valentinus: regarded by Tert. as a Platonist (after the example of Irenaeus) 18, *pr.*; 18, 1; 18, 2; psychological views 18, 4/5; on the λόγος 18, 6; βυθός and σιγή 12, 1; division of men 18, 4; 21, *pr.*; the soul 'immutable' 21, 4.
- Varro, his *Antiquitates divinae* and *A. humanae* drawn upon by Tert., I, 46*; on embryology 27, *pr.*; *A. hum.*: 30, *pr.*; 30, 2; *A. div.*: 37, 1; 39, 2; *Endymiones*: 55, 2; cf. also 32, 2.
- Vergil, (hidden) imitation of — 43, 7 (49, 2); 50, 3; 50, 4; 53, 6.
- Vetusta Placita* I, 29*.
- Vindicianus I, 27*.
- vine described as a living being 19, 4.
- Vincentius Victor I, 48*; 9, 7; 25, 9; 36, 4; 37, 5; 38, 6.
- visions, frequently received on Sunday 9, 4; cf. s. v. 'prophecy'.
- vivisection, estimation of — I, 28*; 10, 4.
- war regarded as a remedy against over-population 30, 4.
- weeping of children at birth 19, 8.
- weight, apparent increase in — of dead bodies 8, 3.
- wine, falsification of — 3, 1.
- women, position of — in the Church 9, 4.
- Xenocrates 5, 1; 6, 6; on the ἡγεμονικόν 15, 5; on sleep 43, 2.
- Zeno of Elea, death of —, 58, 5.
- Zeno (the Stoic), definition of the soul 5, 3; division of the soul 14, 2.

IV. INDEX OF GRAMMAR AND OF LATIN WORDS

Ablat., equivalent to apposition 19, 5 (1, 3); 'resultative' — 19, 5 (27, 5; 31, 2; 50, 4); absolute — without subject 15, 2; — *limitationis* after *alius* 12, 6; — of gerund = present partic. 2, 6; cf. also s. vv. *agere, alius, calere, exulare, minus, periclitari, sub, transigere, viduare*.
aborsus ∞ *abortus* 37, 2.
abruptus 'rash', 'inconsiderate' 8, 1.
absolutus = *certus* 21, 7 (29, 4).
absque = *sine* 43, 7.
accedere transit. 28, 4; = *accidens esse* 6, 5 (10, 7; 20, 4).
accersere = *auxilio* — 5, 1; -*erim* perf. subjunct. 5, 1.
accessio = *accidens* 25, 4.
accidens 9, 1 (cf. s. vv. *accedere* and *accessio*).
accidentia 11, 4.
Accus.: after *quo?* and *unde?* 25, 6; — *graecus* 25, 6 (28, 1); sg. accus. of adjct. = adv. 32, 3; plur. accus., *id.* 48, 1. — *cum infin.*: cf. s. vv. *cedere, certus, congruere, dilucet, dubitare, efficere, esse, evenire, peierare, praestare, tenere*; — *cum infin.* ∞ *Nomin. cum infin.* 45, 6; ∞ indic. 6, 1 (5, 6); dependent on subst.? 46, 8; 57, 11.
actorium 14, 3.
actus in antitheses 11, 1 (27, 5).
adaequare intransit. 8, 1.
addicere 18, 10; with genit. instead of dat. 43, 12.
adeo = *ideo* 1, 4 (8, 5); *non-* = *non magnopere* 43, 3.
adesse with dat. 9, 1.
adhuc = *etiam* 21, 1; = *etiamtum* 19, 3
adimplere 19, 3.
adire, absolute use of — 44, 1.
Adject., used instead of genit. 8, 1; 20, 6; 27, 8; 40, 4; 43, 8; 43, 9; juxtaposition of — and adverb 53, 4; cf. also s. v. 'Adverb' and 'Substantive'.
administrare = *curare* 14, 4 (57, 9).
adpingere = *adnumerare* 40, 4.
adserere, construction 9, 1.
adseverare = *falso affirmare* 17, 2.
adsuescere with dat. 2, 3.
adulari aliquid 43, 5.

adulter = *falsus* 16, 7.
adulterium animae 'apostasy' 41, 4.
Adverb with function of adjct. 1, 2; 2, 3; 6, 3; 8, 3; 9, 7; 31, 4; 36, 4; cf. also s. v. 'Adjective'.
advivere 57, 4.
aedificare 26, 1.
aedituus ∞ *aedetuus* 28, 5.
aemulus = *inimicus* 2, 5 (8, 1); = *diabolus* 20, 5.
aestimatio contrasting with *revelatio* 9, 3.
aestuar referring to digestion 43, 3.
affectare 46, 12; 47, 1.
affectio = -*tus* 31, 3.
affectiosus 19, 9.
affectus = *amor* 16, 6 (56, 2); with concrete sense 56, 2.
affinis with genit. 24, 2.
affirmare, sc. *falso* 57, 5.
affirmator 46, 10.
agere referring to metal-working 37, 7; with ablat. = *degere, vivere* 31, 4; *daemone -i* 1, 4; -*i* almost = *esse* 27, 9.
agnoscere ∞ *adagnoscere* and *adcognoscere* 6, 3.
ahori 57, 1.
alias = 'as it is' 25, 2; 46, 8; 48, 1; 56, 2.
alimonia 25, 4.
alioqui(n) 8, 4; 'for the rest' 39, 4; cf. s. v. 'Pleonasm'.
aliqui(s) added on to proper names 15, 2 (24, 5), -*is* = *alius quis* 20, 4.
alius with ablat. *limitationis* 12, 6.
allocutio 'sermon' 9, 4.
alternare with infin. 29, 3.
alveus = *alvus* 10, 6.
alvus = *alveus* 10, 6.
amaritudo with concrete sense 32, 6.
Ambiguity of *divinus* 23, 1; *Endymion* 55, 4; *Menander* 50, 4; *mundus* 40, 1; *redemptor* (-*imere*) 34, 2; *thamnus* 32, 2; *veneficium* 2, 5; *videri* 45, 2.
ambitio with object. genit. = *studium* 2, 6; = *ambitus* 25, 3.
amentia denoting ecstasy 45, 3.
amigratio = ἀμικρία 30, 2.
an instead of *num* in indirect questions 15, 1.

anima ∞ *animus* 12, *pr.*; = ζῷον 24, 11 (31, 4; 36, 4); *-abus* 33, 11.
animal = ζῷον 1, 2 (25, 5).
animatio 19, 5.
antea avoided by Tert. 17, 14.
 Ἀντιμεταβολή 43, 12.
anuloculter 25, 5.
 Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα occurring in *De anima*: a) Subst.: *actorium* 14, 3; *anuloculter* 25, 5; *avocatrix* 1, 5; *capillago* 51, 3; *factitamentum* 18, 12; *fovella* 7, 3; *frigusculum* 25, 7; *inexperientia* 20, 4; *intellectualitas* 38, 6; *obventus* 41, 1; *papiliunculus* 32, 3; *peccatela* 40, 2; *perculsus* 52, 4; *prosector* 25, 5; *refrigescentia* 43, 3; *reliquatrix* 35, 1; *renidentia* 49, 1; *secundatus* 27, 3; *submersus* 32, 6; *superseminator* 16, 7; b) Adject.: *coimplicitus* 17, 2; *commiscibilis* 12, 5; *conresupinatus* 48, 2; *elementicius* 32, 2; *expugnatorius* 57, 2; *exsuccidus* 32, 3; *fastidibilis* 33, 10; *fatigabilis* 32, 6; *flaturalis* 10, 7; *incommiscibilis* 12, 2; *inefigiabilis* 24, 1; *inoblitteratus* 24, 6; *instructilis* 14, 1; *occisorius* 33, 1; *pervolaticus* 46, 13; *praemonitorius* 3, 1; *properabilis* 43, 3; *revelatorius* 47, 2; *ruboratus* 25, 3; *strangulabilis* 32, 6; *supermundialis* 18, 3; *tardabilis* 43, 3; *vocatorius* 47, 2; c) Verbs: *auruginare* 17, 9; *circumferere* 23, 3; *coagrescere* 5, 5; *compingescere* 25, 2; *devigescere* 27, 6; *evigescere* 38, 3; *ignavescere* 43, 12; *infacere* 53, 5; *praeferere* 33, 5; *redinvenire* 46, 9; *supermetiri* 38, 3 (*pronatus* (?) 2, 3).
apex, metaphor. use of — 46, 11.
apoplexis (-ia) 53, 4.
apostata 2, 3.
apparere: -et bonus = φαίνεται ἀγαθός ὢν 13, 1.
appendix 55, 4.
applaudere with dat. 16, 1.
 Apposition, nomin. in — 9, 7; 24, 3; cf. s. v. 'Ablative'.
apud ∞ *penes* 14, 2.
aquilegus 33, 7.
arbiter 53, 1; = *testis* 25, 3; 'intermediary' 38, 2.
arbitrii libertas (and other terms for 'free will') 20, 5.
arbuscula 19, 3.
arcanum = μυστήριον 18, 3.
arere victu = ξηροφαγεῖν 48, 4.
argumentari, pejorat. sense of — 2, 5, of -atio 2, 5; of -ator 38, 3.
argumentum 57, 11; with genit. 10, 3.

argutus referring to mental qualities 20, 3.
armare, metaphor. use of — 24, 1.
ars = *magia* 34, 2.
artare = *cogere* 35, 2.
artus, plur. ablat. -ubus 10, 7.
artifex used as adj. 1, 5; referring to God 10, 6; to the devil 1, 5.
arvum = *vulva* 27, 8.
aspice introducing an instance 26, 1.
 Asyndeton 6, 4; 27, 1.
atque ita in conclusions 11, 6.
atqui(n) 10, 5.
 'Attraction' of tenses 1, 1; 20, 6; 35, 3; of gender in relat. clauses 15, 1.
auceps referring to the devil 39, 1 (1, 3).
augur used as adj. 19, 8; 24, 10.
auguratus 'augury' 26, 2.
aulaeum, metaphor. use of — 41, 4.
auriga metaphor. use of — 45, 2; 53, 3.
aurula famae 28, 5.
aut si 31, 6.
balneum = *lavacrum baptismi* 50, 4.
baptisma induere 50, 2.
baptizator 50, 4.
bene . . . *quod* 6, 7.
berullus 9, 6.
biaethanatus 57, 1.
-bilis, adj. ending in — with active sense 43, 3.
blandiri aliquid 43, 5.
-bundus = present partic. 39, 1 (34, 5).
caecus 'untransparent' 46, 2; with object. genit. 10, 5.
caedere = *refutare* 21, 1 (34, 1).
caelum, plur. 23, 1.
calere: -ens *matre* 26, 3.
calumniosus 49, 2.
campus, metaphor. use of — 18, 11.
candida (subst.) 58, 2.
candidatus used as adj. 39, 2.
Capherea ∞ *Capharea saxa* 52, 4.
capit = ἐνδέχεται 4 (28, 4).
captare (∞ *aptare*) *coniecturam* 10, 3.
carcer corporis 53, 5.
cardiaca 43, 8.
cardo: -ines = *fines* 43, 8.
carnalis 11, 3.
castimonia 48, 3.
catabolici spiritus 28, 5.
caupo 3, 1.
cavositas 55, 1.
cedere with *accus. c. inf.* 24, 1.
censeri = *oriri* 20, 1; = *vocari* 21, 3.
census = *origo* 1, 1; 'class' 8, 1; 'number' 31, 5.
cerauniae gemmae 9, 6.
certe introducing last part of a sentence 17, 2. -us with *acc. c. inf.* 1, 6.

cervix ∞ -ices 53, 4.

cervus 'fork' 19, 4.

charisma 9, 3.

Chiasm 18, 9.

choicus 40, 3.

'Christianisms' (only cases dealt upon in the commentary): *baptizator* 50, 4; *caelum*, plur. 23, 1; *carnalis* 11, 3; *charisma* 9, 3; *concupiscentia* 16, 6; *consequi* (?) 9, 3; *constitutus* (?) 18, 4; *contemptibilis* 33, 10; *daemonicus* 39, 3; *episcopatus* 16, 6; *figmentum* = *res creata* 37, 5; *fornicarius* 35, 1; *genimen* 21, 4; *genitura* 'incarnation' 23, 5; *glorificare* 26, 4; *mundialis* 54, 4; *persona* (*ex*, *a*, *in*, *sub* —) 17, 12; *prophelare* 11, 4; *revelatio* 55, 4; *salvum facere* 13, 3; *sanctificare* 26, 5; *traditor* 'traitor' 11, 5; *transgressor* 35, 3.

circumferre 8, 3 (9, 7).

circumfingere 23, 3.

circumgelare 23, 5.

circumscribere 'to deceive' 57, 6.

circumstantia 47, 3.

citius = *facilius*, *potius* 3, 3.

citra = *extra*, *praeter* 20, 4.

Clausula, influence of — on word-order, choice of words or structure of sentence: 1, 1; 2, 2; 2, 3; 10, 3; 17, 2; 17, 6; 17, 11; 20, 2; 22, 2; 25, 9; 31, 4; 35, 6; 41, 3; 43, 1; 43, 11; 46, 6; 48, 2; 48, 3; 51, 8; 55, 2.

clavis, metaphor. use of — 55, 5.

coacte 42, 2.

coadolescere 16, 1.

coetaneus (adject.) with genit. 31, 2.

cogere: *sonum* — 19, 7.

cogitatio ∞ -tus 9, 8.

cogitatorium 14, 3.

cognitor 18, 10.

colatus = *purus* 9, 6 (48, 1).

collectus = *solidus* 37, 6; = *brevis* 37, 6

collocare 20, 6.

commeatus vitae 30, 5.

commentator 15, 5.

commercium 4.

commiscibilis 12, 5.

committere 'to bring into conflict' 2, 5;

'to bring about' 32, 4; 'to sin' 58, 6.

communicare intransit. 5, 5; -*in* with accus. 19, 2.

comparare 'to put on a level' 2, 2.

compellere with infin. 53, 3; with subjunct. 56, 8.

compendium 14, 4; 50, 5.

compingere 25, 2.

compingescere 25, 2.

componere mortuum 51, 6.

compos = *consciūs* 2, 2 (24, 4; 34, 3; 55, 2); = — *mentis* 45, 4.

compositicius 9, 2.

conari ad superna 19, 5.

concordia discors 8, 1.

concupiscentivum 16, 3.

concussio 3, 1.

condere pacem 51, 6.

condicere 8, 1.

condicionalis 52, 2.

conditio = *creatio* 6, 9 (9, 8); = *creatura* 27, 8.

configurare 9, 8.

conflagratio = ἐκπύρωσις 54, 1.

congregi alicui 1, 1.

congruere with accus. c. inf. 44, 3; -*entissimus* 58, 6.

coniectura with object. genit. 53, 2.

consatus (∞ *consitus*) 5, 3; 43, 2; 43, 4.

conscientia with object. genit. 17, 2.

conseptum 53, 5.

consequens est, ut 4.

consequi frequently used by Christian authors 9, 3.

conserere 11, 6; 25, 8.

consignare = *confirmare* 46, 12.

consistere: argumentatio -it 'is valid' 24, 12.

consitus, cf. s. v. *consatus*.

consolari iniuriam 1, 2.

conspuere, metaphor. use of — 50, 2.

consternatus 1, 2.

constiti with 'ingressive' sense 1, 1.

constitutio 4.

constitutus = καθεστώς, ὢν 18, 4.

Constructio ad sensum 48, 3; 50, 1; 57, 7; 58, 6.

consultus 'intentional' 1, 4.

consummare intransit. 42, 1.

'*Contaminatio*' 9, 5; 33, 3; 45, 6; 46, 11.

contingit = *pertinet ad* 17, 1.

convenire = *percipere* 6, 4 (18, 5); = *accusare* 15, 4 (40, 4); = *compellare* 25, 3.

conventare 54, 3.

'*Conversio*' 28, 3; 57, 9.

corpulentia with concrete sense 5, 2 (28, 2).

coruscare referring to *evangelium* 49, 3.

credere, constructions of — 15, 4; -*o* in parentheses 26, 3; 'ingressive' sense of -*idi* 50, 5.

credulitas 44, 2.

crementum 25, 4.

criminator referring to the devil 35, 3.

culleus 33, 6.

cum with indic., with 'adversative' sense 33, 10.

cunctari de 6, 7.

curiositas 2, 4; 'magic trick' 28, 4.

custodia = *carcer* 35, 2.

daemoni(a)cus 39, 3; 46, 12.

- damnare* 'to vex', 'to torment' 28, 2;
= *claudere*, *obstruere* 28, 2.
dare = *concedere* 10, 9 (9, 2).
Dative: substituted by Genit., cf. s. v.
'Genitive'; — *finalis* equivalent to
adject. 48, 3 (cf. 46, 4); — *auctoris*
6, 4; possess. — 29, 2; cf. also s. vv.
adesse, *adsuere*, *applaudere*, *con-*
gredi, *delegare*, *inaugurare*, *incursare*,
instruere, *obiacere*, *operari*, *prae-*
iudicare, *subiacere*.
de used instead of partit. genit. 24, 5
(20, 4); joined on to 'modal' ablat.
1, 3; to ablat. *limitationis* 19, 5
(32, 10); to instrum. ablat. 3, 3;
— *die* = *cotidie* 30, 3; — *longinquo*
17, 2.
debitrix 35, 4.
debitum naturae (i. e. 'death') 50, 2.
debitus = *editus* 24, 11 (9, 1).
decedere, cf. s. v. *discedere*.
decem septem 14, 2.
decessio 'death' 35, 6.
decoquere 'to digest' 10, 5; = *minuere*
53, 3.
decoriare 33, 3.
decumanus (sc. *fluctus*) 52, 4.
decurrere 'to take place' 10, 7.
decursio vitae 24, 8.
dedicare = *initiare* 19, 7.
dedignari, construction 32, 1.
deducere = *docere* 15, 3 (43, 10).
defaectio 27, 6.
defectus (partic.) 28, 5.
defendere = *comprobare* 11, 1 (9, 1;
21, 3).
defetiscentia 43, 2.
deficere used in polemics 29, 2.
definitio 'syllogism' 6, 2.
defraudatio 43, 8.
dehinc 17, 3.
delator referring to the devil 35, 3.
delegare with dat. 56, 6.
delibare 58, 3.
deliberare = *dubitare* 17, 13.
delicium 'pet animal' 24, 5.
delictum ∞ *peccatum* 16, 2.
deliquium animae 44, 3.
delirare referring to pagan philosophers
32, 1.
demonstrator = *interpres* 1, 6.
demutare 'to transfer', 'to shift' 24, 9;
— *bilis* 21, 4.
denegare 'to make impossible' 25, 4
(53, 3).
denique 'for instance' 1, 3.
depellere daemonia 1, 6.
depreiare 17, 3.
depugnare transit. 52, 4.
derelinquere 5, 6.
derogare 38, 3.
deserere = *deficere* 51, 3.
designatus with genit. 39, 4.
despoliare = *cute spoliare* 33, 3.
despumare transit. and intransit. 27, 5.
despuere = *abominari* or *refellere*
50, 2.
destinare 19, 5.
detrudere leto 56, 3.
devenire ∞ Fr. *devenir* 11, 2.
devertere ∞ *di-* 53, 1.
devocare in dubium 17, 13.
devorsorium ∞ *di-* 7, 4.
dies, gender of — 56, 7.
differentia with concrete sense 4.
digerere 9, 4.
digestio = *concoctio* 43, 3.
digestus = *concoctio* 10, 6.
dignatio (principis, dei) 47, 2.
dignitas = *ordo* 31, 5.
dilucet with accus. c. *infin.* 15, 4.
diluere ∞ *de-* 50, 3.
dilutus = *infirmus* 24, 2.
diluvio 46, 4.
dinosci, pleon. use of *-itur* 17, 11.
directo 52, 2.
dirigere = *interpretari* 1, 6; = *digerere*
25, 9.
discedere ∞ *de-* 31, 2; = *mori* 56, 6.
discipula 54, 3.
discordia concors 8, 1.
discruciare = *cruciando dirimere* 53, 4.
dispector 15, 4.
dispensatio 43, 3.
dispicere ∞ *de-* in MSS 13, 1.
dispositio 3, 2.
dispunctio 33, 10; — *ngere* 33, 1.
dissimulatio 43, 12.
dissipare = *dilaniare* 33, 5.
dissolubilis 9, 2.
dissolutrix 42, 1.
distinctio 'isolation' 11, 2.
diversitas 'isolation' (?) 16, 2.
dividere with pregnant sense 18, 5.
divinitas ∞ *divinatio* 28, 1.
divinus, twofold sense of — 28, 1;
— *ae* (sc. *litterae*) 15, 5.
divisus = *diversus* 37, 5 (27, 8).
divortium 7, 3 (44, 3).
divus ∞ *deus* 2, 3.
dogma 33, 1.
domare, metaphor. use of — 30, 3.
dominatrix 22, 2.
dominica sollemnia 9, 4.
domus, plur. accus. — *us* 46, 13.
dormire = *obdormiscere* 43, 9 (43, 10;
45, 3).
dormitio 'sleep of death' 55, 4; 'resting-
place' 55, 4.
dos = *donum* 2, 1; — *tare* = *donare* 2, 1.
Double names 31, 3.
dubitare with accus. c. *infin.* 46, 13.

- dubium, in-deducere* 24, 3; *in-devocare* 17, 13.
ducere referring to metal-working 37, 7; = *docere* (?) 15, 8.
dum with causal sense 30, 4; 'provided' 49, 3; 52, 4.
dumtaxat 10, 1.
durus 'hard to believe' 28, 3 (17, 2).
ebibere 43, 9.
ecce enim at the beginning of sentences 6, 5.
ecquis and *et quis* confused in MSS 18, 12; *ecquid* = *nonne* 18, 12.
ecstasis 45, 3.
ediscere 43, 12.
edocere 51, 1.
effatus (subst.) 6, 3.
efficacia = ἐνεργεια 14, 3.
efficere with *accus. c. infin.* 2, 4.
effigiare 9, 2.
effruticare 27, 8.
effundere partum 25, 2.
elierare (at baptism) 35, 3.
elanguere 53, 3.
Eleazarus ∼ *Lazarus* 7, 2.
elidere = *refellere* 23, 6.
eliquare 30, 3.
Ellipsis: of verbal forms: 2, 2; 3, 2; 4; 5, 4; 7, 1; 25, 9; 26, 3; 28, 4; 30, 5; 42, 1; 46, 5; 51, 4; 57, 7; of subst.: 15, 5; 32, 6; of *et* in third member of sentence 27, 1 (26, 3; 31, 5; 45, 4; 46, 12); of pronoun in *accus. c. infin.* 2, 6 (18, 9; 23, 1; 46, 5); of antecedens 9, 1 (17, 9); of relat. pronoun 6, 7.
elogium 17, 10.
eloquium 2, 2.
emaculare 24, 5.
emendicare, metaphor. use of — 51, 1.
ementiri amicum 34, 4.
enim opening discussion 4.
enormitas 43, 8.
entelechia 32, 4.
enubilare 3, 3.
erogare 30, 5.
eruditio with object. genit. 24, 5.
esse: *est* with *infin.* 36, 2; with *accus. c. infin.* 47, 3 (51, 4).
esuries 24, 6.
esus 10, 6.
et: pleonastic use of — 1, 6 (8, 1); — before interrogat. pronoun 7, 2 (8, 1; 17, 5; 24, 8); — = — *quidem* 10, 4 (18, 5); — . . . *etiam* 20, 2; — *si* instead of *si* — 24, 12; omission of *et* in third part of enumeration or sentence, cf. s. v. 'Ellipsis'; inversion of — 34, 4.
ethnicus 3, 3.
etiam: pleonastic use of — 56, 2; 'still further' 46, 1; at the end of an enumeration 32, 3; 32, 6.
evacuare 33, 2; = *aliquid vacuum existimare* 46, 3.
evenire with *accus. c. infin.* 53, 5.
eventus 2, 1; 'chance' 46, 2.
eversio 26, 4.
evocator (-are) 53, 6.
ex abundanti 7, 1; *e(x) contrario* 5, 1; *ex falso* = *falsum* 28, 3.
examen 23, 4 (30, 2; 36, 1).
examinatio 10, 3.
examinator 2, 6.
excessus 'digression' 25, 1; 'ecstasy' 45, 3.
excidere sibi 25, 9; -it mihi = *obliviscor* 25, 9.
excludere daemonia 2, 5 (57, 5).
exercitius 'busy' 43, 5.
exhalare intransit. 55, 3 (54, 4).
exhibe 10, 5.
exitus = *exilium* 51, 4.
exodium 51, 3.
exonerare 30, 2.
exorbiatio 24, 2.
exorcismus 57, 5.
expavescere transit. 30, 4.
expeditio 2, 6.
explodere 53, 1.
expugnatio = *op-* 34, 2.
expungere = *absolvere* 22, 1.
exquisitus referring to torments 33, 5.
exspectare and *spectare* confused in MSS 43, 11.
ex(s)ternatus 1, 2.
exterminare = *evertere* 45, 5.
extimus 48, 1.
extorris with object. genit. 25, 2.
extraneus with object. genit. 25, 2.
extremior 33, 10.
extrinsecus with function of *adject.* 6, 3.
exulare with *ablat.* 56, 8.
fabalia = *seges fabarum* 31, 4.
facere ad = *pertinere ad* 38, 1; 'to contribute to' 38, 1.
facies = *forma, species* 53, 4; 'front page' 13, 2; — *saeculi (terrae)* 2, 3.
facilis with passive *infin.* 30, 5; -ius = *citius, potius* 1, 4.
facinus 'criminal' 25, 5; 'victim' 25, 5.
facilitamentum 18, 12.
factura = τὸ ποιεῖσθαι 4.
facultas = οὐκία 47, 4.
familiaris with *causat.* sense 48, 4.
famulus (*adject.*) with *genit.* 33, 9.
femina (*adject.*) 36, 3.
fenerare = *augere* 30, 2.
fetus 6, 8.
figus, plur. *accus. -us* 21, 4.
figmentum 37, 5.
figulatio 25, 2.

figurare 'to symbolize' 18, 4.
filii = *liberi* 5, 4.
fines = *pudenda* 38, 2.
ingere aliquem canentem, etc. 25, 2.
firmiter est = *verius est* 10, 9.
fistulae arteriarum 10, 7.
folles pulmonum 10, 7.
fons animarum 20, 6; *-tes uberum* 56, 5.
forma 'rule' 2, 2 (6, 1; 29, 2); *ex-a* 44, 3.
fornicarius 35, 1.
fortasse 5, 1.
fraternitas = *fratres* 48, 3.
frons 'front page' 13, 2.
frustratorius 47, 1.
fulcire cibo 6, 6.
fungi, absolute use of — 9, 8 (19, 3; 27, 5); — *morte* 35, 6.
fut(t)ilis 23, 1.
Future, *gnomic* 8, 4; 56, 3; in subordinate clauses 10, 6; 32, 3; 37, 7 (38, 5); 47, 2; 47, 4; 'persevering' 1, 1; 38, 5.
Geminatio 17, 13.
generositas = *εὐγενεία* 8, 4.
genimen 21, 4.
Genitive, used instead of *dat.* 2, 5; 5, 1; 6, 3; 15, 2; 38, 3; 40, 1; 43, 5; 43, 7; 43, 12; 46, 2; 48, 4; equivalent to *adject.* 1, 2; 17, 12; 28, 2; 35, 4; 43, 12; substituted by *adject.*, cf. s. v. 'Adjective'; — *qualitatis* equivalent to *adject.* 14, 3; 35, 2; *Variatio* of — *qualitatis* and *adject.* 27, 4; — *inhaerentiae* 54, 4; — *inversus* 32, 6; remarkable use of possess. — 37, 1; cf. also s. vv. *addicere*, *affinis*, *ambitio*, *argumentum*, *caecus*, *coaelaneus*, *coniectura*, *conscientia*, *designatus*, *eruditio*, *extorris*, *extraneus*, *famulus*, *humanus*, *intactus*, *intrepidus*, *miserari*, *occasio*, *passibilis*, *postumus*, *prospectus*, *stupidus*, *tempus*, *vernaculus*.
genitura = *creatio* 23, 5; = *creatura* 38, 3; = *facultas generandi* 46, 5.
genius = *daemon* 39, 3.
gentilitas 'nationality' 24, 9 (30, 2).
genus = — *humanum* 20, 6; = *sexus* 36, 4; *hypallage* after — 44, 2.
gerere: *amicum* —, etc. 34, 4.
gerula 19, 8.
Gerundive equivalent to *fut. partic.* of the passive 35, 6; to present *partic.* 39, 2.
gesticulari aliquid 45, 2.
glorificare 26, 4.
gradus 6, 5; 15, 1; 24, 4.
grassari 52, 3.
gratulatio = *gaudium* 1, 3.
grossus 54, 4.
habere with *infin.* 32, 4; *-et* with *adverb*

28, 1; *-et* with *accus.* 'il y a' 55, 3;
-es = *tenes*, *novisti* 13, 3.
haeresis 3, 1.
haustus = *aer hauriendus* 54, 4.
hebdomas 39, 2.
hic qui, meanings of — 31, 3; *hoc* summing up a preceding sentence 24, 1.
hinc . . . *quod* 17, 10.
historia 23, 4 (28, 5).
hodiernus: *ad-m* ∞ *in-m* 34, 1.
homo 'human existence' 35, 6 (44, 1); = *corpus* 35, 6; — *interior* = *anima* 9, 8; *sui-inis* 35, 6.
honor 3, 2; 'beauty' 56, 2.
horre, absolute use of — 30, 3.
hospitium 55, 5.
humanus = *object. genit.* 46, 11.
humor = *semen* 27, 5.
hypogaeum 28, 4.
iam ergo 12, 5.
ianitrix used as *adject.* 55, 4.
ianua nativitatis 39, 1 — *mortis* 53, 4.
ibidem = *statim* 19, 7.
idea 18, 3.
idem ∞ *ipse* 32, 10; 35, 6; — referring to something not explicitly mentioned 34, 2 (cf. 49, 2).
ideoque = *ideo* 45, 6.
idoneus 9, 4; *-ior* 18, 3.
ieiunare, construction 6, 7.
ieiunium indicere 48, 3.
ignitus 9, 6.
ille, pleonastic use of — 9, 8.
illuminatio ∞ *baptism* 41, 4.
imago ∞ *veritas* 7, 2.
imbuiere 31, 2.
immolare, metaphor. use of — 33, 9.
immunis a 7, 3.
impassibilis 12, 3.
impendere = *delere* 51, 4.
Impersonal use of the pass. 6, 9; of 3. sg. 48, 2; cf. also s. v. 'Infin.'. *implicatio* 2, 6.
improspecte 24, 7.
in with *ablat.* = *inter* 31, 4; with *ablat.* instead of *accus.* 8, 2 (*in dei gloria*); 27, 8 (*in uno*); with *accus.* instead of *ablat.* 6, 8 (*in unum*); — *identitatis* 19, 6 (33, 3); — *aperto* 17, 6; — *causa esse* 17, 6; — *discreto* 10, 8; — *medio* ('obvious') 51, 1; — *proximo* ('obvious') 44, 3; — *spiritu esse (fieri)* 8, 5 (9, 4); — *vero* 57, 5; — *causam* 38, 4; — *totum* 6, 6.
in- a meaningless addition (e. g. *inornare* = *ornare*) 19, 3.
inanire 12, 3.
inaugurare with *dat.* 37, 4.
incedere viam 35, 2.
incolere 17, 11.

incolatus 57, 2.
incongruentia 6, 2.
inconvertibilis 21, 7.
incorruptibilis 24, 1.
incubator 49, 2.
incubo 44, 2; -us 44, 2.
incursare with accus. or dat. 2, 3.
incursus daemonum 57, 4.
inde = *ab eo*, etc. 35, 1.
indignativum 16, 3.
indissolubilis 9, 2.
indivuitas 51, 2.
indubitate 23, 1.
inducere = *docere* 9, 7 (23, 1)
indure (∞) *metempsychosis* 33, 9;
 — *baptisma* 50, 2; — *Christum* 50, 2.
indulgentia = *donum* 14, 4.
ineffigiatus 9, 2.
ineffigiabilis 24, 1.
ineptum (est), *ut* 42, 1.
infamare 17, 2.
infantia = -*tes* 25, 5 (26, 2).
infanticidium 25, 5.
infecire, construction of — 6, 7.
 Infinitive, after prepositions 4; used
 as subst. 17, 12; pronoun added on
 to — 10, 7; impersonal use of
 passive — 5, 6; 30, 5; — after
verba sentiendi et declarandi on the
 analogy of *verba voluntatis* 38, 2;
 cf. also s. vv. *alternare*, *compellere*,
esse, *facilis*, *habere*, *minari*, *monere*,
praecipere, *praevenire*, *servare*, *sor-*
tiri, *superest*.
infringere palmam 1, 3.
infulcire 11, 3 (23, 4).
ingenium 'invention' 1, 6 (2, 3).
iniecio = ἐπιβολή and εἰσβολή 34, 3
 (*inicare*. *ib.*).
iniriari aliquid 43, 12.
inoblitteratus 24, 6.
inobscurabilis 3, 4.
inornare = *ornare* 19, 3.
inquies (subst.) 25, 3.
inquilinus 38, 4.
inruere transit. 24, 8; = *devorare* 31, 4.
insinuatio 46, 12.
insolescere 'to increase <shamelessly>' 30, 4.
instantia 'immediate occurrence' 56, 2.
instinctus 16, 1 (27, 5).
instruclilis = *structilis* 14, 1.
instructus (subst.) 19, 2.
instrumentum '(part of) Holy Scrip-
 ture' 11, 3.
instruere 5, 3; — *alicui aliquid* 10, 6
 (35, 1).
intactus with genit. 26, 4.
intendere = *intueri* 47, 3.
intentio = *accusatio* 15, 4; = *observatio*
 47, 3.

inter: — *eos* 'one of them' 9, 5 (42, 2);
 — *cetera* . . . *quoque* 46, 11; = *apud*
 2, 4 (54, 2).
interdum with function of adj. 22, 1.
interest de 25, 2 (1, 2).
interim 'provisionally' 9, 7.
interpolator referring to the devil 16, 7.
interpretari with dat. (?) 46, 4.
interstruere 53, 2.
intonare 28, 1.
intrepidus with genit. 32, 6.
intrinsecus with function of adj. 6, 3.
intus with function of adj. 9, 7.
inurere 20, 3.
invadere aliquid 26, 3; = *devorare*
 31, 4.
invehi with dat. 19, 5.
investis 56, 5.
inviscare 1, 3.
invitatio daemonum 39, 1.
iocundus 52, 3.
ipse instead of *is* 2, 1; ∞ *idem* 10, 9
 (14, 5; 32, 9); — *um quod* = *eo ipso*
 quod 32, 9; referring to something
 not explicitly mentioned 34, 2.
iste = *hic* 1, 1 (17, 13).
iugulatio 25, 5.
iuxta 2, 1.
lactare ∞ -*ere* 19, 9.
lapathus, vulgar forms of — 32, 2.
laqueus, metaphor. use of — 2, 5.
lavare intransit. 50, 4.
 Law terms discussed in the com-
 mentary:
addicere 18, 10; *affirmator* 46, 10;
artare = *cogere* 35, 2; *calumniosus*
 49, 2; *cognitor* 18, 10; *committere*
 'to bring about' 32, 4; *compendium*
 50, 5; *condicionalis* 52, 2; *conjectura*
 with genit. 53, 2; *consortium* 2, 2;
constitutus 18, 4; *convenire* = *accu-*
sare 15, 4; *debitrix* 35, 4; *depretiare*
 17, 3; *derogare* 38, 3; *destinatus* with
 genit. 39, 4; *directo* 52, 3; *dispungere*
 33, 1 (-*ctio* 33, 10); *dotalis* (-*e man-*
cipium) 41, 4; *elogium* 17, 10; *ex*
abundanti 7, 1; *examinatio* 10, 3;
frustratorius 47, 1; *idoneus* 9, 4
 (-*ior* 18, 3); *incolatus* 57, 2; *incubator*
 49, 2; *infamare* 17, 2 (3); *inquili-*
natus 38, 5; *inquilinus* 38, 4; *intentio*
 'charge' 15, 4; *liberare* = *absolvere*
 17, 10; *licentia* = *potestas* 2, 2;
mancipare 33, 9; *obtinere* = -*litem*
 12, 6; *onerare* = *accusare* 17, 4
 (40, 4); *patrocinarum* 2, 4; *patrocinium*
 13, 3; *peraequatio* (?) 24, 3; *post-*
liminium 35, 6; *praeiudicare* 2, 2
 (with dat. 8, 5); *praeiudicium* 2, 5;
praeogativa 39, 4; *principaliter* (?)

- 18, 9; *promulgare* 11, 3 (46, 6); *provocare* 2, 2 (19, 3); *rato fieri* 35, 1; *reatus* 39, 3; *reliquo* 56, 4; *reliquaria* 35, 1; *renuntiator* 57, 11; *repromittere* 9, 4; *reputare* 12, 6; *rescindere* 43, 8; *rescissio* 53, 3; *salvo eo, ut* (?) 18, 6; *satisfieri* 35, 1; *spondere* 50, 2; *sponsor* 9, 4; *stipulari* 50, 2; *subscribere* = *concedere* 40, 4; *superfluum* 51, 4; *testimonium ex aemulo* 2, 5; *usurpatio* 58, 2; *usus (ac) fructus* 54, 3; *vindicta, per-m liberare* 34, 4.
- laxare metalla* 37, 6.
- lectulus* (instrument of torture) 55, 5.
- lenocinium* 48, 4.
- liberalitas* = *donum* 47, 2.
- liberare* = *absolvere* 17, 10.
- licere* without object (*-et mihi* = *potens sum*) 28, 5; *-ebit* instead of *-et* 20, 2; 32, 2.
- linea*, metaphor. use of — 26, 1.
- linguatus* 3, 1.
- litteratura* 57, 2.
- loculus*, metaphor. use of — 48, 2.
- locus* 1, 2; *-i muliebres* 25, 2; *-us libidinis publicae* 34, 2.
- loquium* 6, 7.
- lorica pectoris* 15, 5.
- loricare* 38, 5.
- lucusta* 15, 2.
- ludibriosus* 47, 1.
- ludificare* ~ *-ri* 17, 14.
- magia* ~ *magica* 57, 1.
- magis* = *potius* 5, 1; 29, 1; — *est, ut* 31, 2.
- magister* referring to Socrates 1, 2.
- maledicere* transit. 35, 2.
- malle aliquid* 31, 4.
- malus* = *diabolus* 11, 5.
- mandibula* 10, 5.
- mansio* 54, 1.
- manum porrigere* 5, 6.
- mas* with function of adj. 36, 3.
- massa* 13, 1.
- materialis* 21, 3.
- matrix* 19, 6.
- medella* 46, 9.
- mediocritas* = *parvitas* 10, 6; = *media pars* 53, 4.
- meditari* intransit. 17, 3; — *mortem* 43, 12.
- memoria* = *sepulcrum* 46, 12.
- mens* 12, 1.
- mentio* = *titulus, nomen* 13, 1; 35, 3.
- mentiri amicum*, etc. 34, 4; *-or, si* 19, 7.
- merces* = *merx* 34, 2.
- merx* = *merces* 34, 2.
- messis* = *abscisio* 53, 4.
- metatio* = *domicilium, hospitium* 14, 5.
- metempsychosis* 31, 5.
- metensomatosis* 31, 5.
- methodicus* 6, 6.
- milesia* 23, 4.
- minari* with present infin., without accus. 13, 3; *ad superna* — 19, 5.
- ministerium* = *minister* 40, 2.
- minus* with ablat. = *sine* 35, 1.
- minutal* 32, 3.
- minutiloquium* 6, 7.
- miscere* = *unire* 45, 3.
- miserari* with genit. 25, 5.
- modicus* = *parvus* 10, 6.
- modulari* 37, 1.
- monere* with infin. 25, 9.
- Moses (Moyses)*, genit. of — 35, 6.
- motator* 12, 1.
- motorium* 14, 3.
- mundialis* 54, 4.
- mundipotens* 23, 2.
- munificentia* = *munus* 14, 4.
- mutare* intransit. 29, 2; 'to transfer', 'to shift' 24, 9 (25, 3).
- mutuari aliquid* 23, 6.
- nam et* instead of *iam et* 10, 2.
- Names*, double 31, 3.
- nativitas* 11, 6; 28, 1.
- nativitus* 12, 1.
- natura* ~ *substantia* 9, 6; 32, 8; = *pudenda* 46, 5.
- naturalia* 'natural faculties' 20, 1; = *pudenda* 46, 5.
- ne* instead of *ut non* 6, 5 (16, 7; 57, 9).
- nec* = *ne* . . . *quidem* 5, 6.
- necdum* = *nondum* 19, 3.
- negare* = *irritum reddere* 25, 4.
- Neologisms occurring in *De anima*:**
- A. Words used by Tert. only (T). 1. Subst.: *ahorus* 57, 1; *biaeothanatus* 57, 1; *despectrix* 23, 2; *figulatio* 25, 2; *naturalitas* 16, 1; *novellitas* 28, 3; *recidivatus* 28, 2; *recogitatus* 6, 8; *veclaculum* (?) 53, 3; *visualitas* 29, 3; *vivicomburium* 1, 6 (33, 6); Adject.: *concupiscentivus* 16, 3 (4.5); *extranaturalis* 43, 1 (.6); *mundipotens* 23, 2; *sapientialis* 15, 1 (.4); Adv.: *temporatum* 28, 1; Verbs: *effructicare* 27, 8; *inornare* 19, 3; *supparare* 25, 9 (30, 5); *transvenire* 23, 6. — B. Words used by Tert. for the first time (Tp). 1. Subst.: *adulatrix* 51, 4; *apostata* 11, 5; *argumentator* 38, 3; *aversatrix* 51, 4; *cogitatorium* 14, 3; *contrarietas* 29, 3; *corporalitas* 7, 1; *deceptus* 18, 4; *dedecoratio* 34, 4; *defaecatio* 27, 6; *defetiscentia* 43, 2; *defraudatio* 43, 8; *dilatatio* 37, 6; *diluvio* 46, 4; *dissentia* 23, 6; *dissolutrix* 42, 1; *divinatrix* 22, 2; *episcopatus* 16, 6; *esuries* 24, 6; *exorbitatio* 24, 2;

- exorcismus* 57, 5; *incongruentia* 6, 2; *incubator* 49, 2; *indivinitas* 51, 2; *infanticidium* 25, 5; *inquilinatus* 38, 5; *mandibula* 10, 5; *minutiloquium* 6, 7; *motator* 12, 1; *nuditas* 33, 5; *operatrix* 11, 4; *paratura* 2, 3; *passivitas* 4; *peraequatio* 24, 3; *peremptrix* 42, 1; *postremitas* 53, 4; *praedicatrix* 46, 8; *praelibatio* 58, 2; *praenuntiatio* 46, 12; *praeparatura* 43, 9; *principalitas* 13, 1; *puerarius* 55, 4; *quinio* 6, 8; *rationalitas* 38, 6; *recreator* 43, 7; *redintegrator* 43, 7; *reminiscentia* 23, 6; *retractatus* 2, 6; *segregatio* 43, 2; *sensualitas* 17, 2; *sepulchrum* 46, 7; *structus* (?) 18, 5; *suffectio* 28, 2; *transgressor* 35, 3; 2. Adject.: *aedificatorius* 47, 2; *affectuosus* 19, 9; *aquilegus* 33, 7; *cadaverinus* 32, 6; *circumcordialis* 15, 5; *contemporalis* 27, 4; *convertibilis* 21, 4; *demutabilis* 21, 4; *distantivus* 9, 1; *divisibilis* 14, 1; *famulatus* 33, 1; *frustratorius* 47, 1; *impassibilis* 12, 3; *inconvertibilis* 21, 7; *incorruptibilis* 24, 1; *indignativus* 16, 3; *indivisibilis* 51, 5; *inobscurabilis* 3, 4; *intellectualis* 6, 4; *invitatorius* 57, 2; *linguatus* 3, 1; *materialis* 21, 3; *methodicus* 6, 6; *mundialis* 54, 4; *paredrus* 28, 5; *passibilis* 7, 4; *propheticus* 2, 3; *quadrangulatus* 17, 2; *scabidus* 38, 2; *sensualis* 18, 2; *subaquaneus* 32, 3; *substantivus* 20, 1; Adv.: *moderanter* 17, 4; *passibiliter* 45, 4; Verbs: *coadulescere* 16, 1; *convenire* 54, 3; *deminorare* 33, 9; *desultare* 32, 6; *enubillare* 3, 3; *inviscare* 1, 3; *recorporare* 33, 7; *redaccendere* 30, 5; *relluminare* 34, 4; *subdividere* 16, 3; *subremanere* 18, 10; *supersapere* 18, 2; *titulare* 13, 1.
- nescio* with accus. 8, 4; -an 'probably not' 1, 2.
- Neuter: cf. s. v. 'Nominal predicate'. *ni* 25, 4.
- nisi quod* 34, 5; -si 46, 10.
- nomen*: *frigidum* — = — *frigoris* 27, 5; *sui* -is 35, 6; — almost = 'being' 40, 2.
- Nominative, used instead of *dat.* *finalis* 25, 6; 51, 2; cf. also s. v. 'Apposition'; — *cum infin.* ∞ *accus. cum. inf.* 45, 6; after *sustineri* 56, 4.
- Nominal predicate, neuter gender of — 27, 9 (39, 2; 43, 1).
- nominatio* 13, 2.
- non*: in *ὁφ' ἐν* 2, 5; — *modo . . . sed* 19, 2; — *puto* = *puto* — 10, 6. 7; — *statim* 4; — *tamen* 24, 4.
- nos* referring to Montanists 9, 4.
- noster* = *Christianus* 2, 1 (7, 1; 20, 1).
- notare* 40, 2.
- num* = *nonne* 47, 3 (49, 3).
- numquid* = *num* 32, 7.
- obfirmare* intransit. 24, 5.
- obiacere* with *dat.* 'to contrast with' 8, 2.
- oblatio* 52, 2.
- obligare* (in religion) 39, 3.
- obmuss(iti)are* 18, 1.
- obsequium* with concrete sense 18, 6.
- obstetrix*, metaphor. use of — 39, 2.
- obstrepere* = *adversari* 24, 10.
- obstruere* intransit. 24, 5.
- obtinere* = *hitem*-, *vincere* 12, 6.
- obumbrare* 39, 1 (45, 6).
- occasio* = *ἀφορμή* 24, 12; with *genit.* 44, 1.
- odii*, perf. of *odi* 10, 4.
- officium* with concrete sense 37, 1; 'function' 12, 6.
- omen* 24, 10.
- omnimodus* 25, 1.
- omnis* = *plenus*, *perfectus* 26, 1 (28, 2; 46, 12); -ia at the end of an enumeration = *denique omnia* or *cetera omnia* 17, 11; *per* -ia 9, 4; — instead of *utroque* 31, 5.
- onerare* = *accusare* 40, 4 (17, 4).
- opera* = *opus* 10, 8 (11, 1; 14, 4; 27, 5).
- operari* with *dat.* 18, 8; transit. 18, 3; -atior = -antior 57, 6.
- operator* (-trix) 11, 4.
- operositas* = *περιεργία* 2, 6.
- opimitas* 20, 4.
- oportere*, constructions of — 17, 10.
- op(p)ortunus* 7, 3.
- ordo* 22, 1 (50, 1).
- organum* 10, 2.
- originalis* = *patriarchalis* 3, 3.
- origo* = *patriarcha* 3, 3; 'ancestor' 30, 2.
- oscillum*, metaphor. use of — 12, 2.
- palaestra*, metaphor. use of — 2, 6.
- pangere* = *serere* 30, 3.
- Parallelism, influence of — on structure of sentence 1, 1; 1, 6; 2, 4; 7, 1; 18, 5; 24, 2; incomplete — 1, 4; 3, 3; 43, 11; 50, 3.
- paratura* '(part of) Holy Scripture' 2, 3.
- paredri spiritus* 28, 5.
- parere* = *apparere* 6, 3.
- pariare* intransit. 30, 5.
- Partic. instead of indic. 1, 3; 17, 2 (18, 2; 25, 6).
- partum aperire* 26, 2; — *effundere* 25, 2.
- pasci luce* 56, 3.
- passibilis* with object. *genit.* 12, 3.
- passivitas* 4.

- passivus* 4.
patrocinium with concrete sense 13, 3.
pavus 33, 8.
pax = *osculum pacis* 51, 6.
peculium = *proprietas* 37, 5.
pecus, -*udis* 'sheep' 13, 3.
pecus, -*oris* 'embryo' 25, 5 'domestic animal' 30, 3.
peierare with *accus. c. infin.* 28, 3.
penes ∼ *apud* 14, 2.
pensare 58, 7.
pepo 'blockhead' 32, 1.
peraequare, absolute use of — 29, 2.
peraequatio 24, 3.
peremptorius 25, 5.
peremptrix 42, 1.
 Perfect with 'ingressive' sense 1, 1; 50, 5.
perfectus (subst.) 20, 3.
perfundere referring to baptism 50, 5.
perichlitari with *ablat. limitationis* 27, 6; — *de* 9, 2.
perinde with function of *adject.* 34, 3; 43, 10; — ... *quia* 33, 3.
permittere, construction of — 18, 2.
perosus with passive sense 1, 6.
persona 40, 3; *ex, sub, in -a* 17, 12; *ex -a* = *ex voce alicuius* (?) 57, 11.
 Personification 5, 4; 14, 2; 18, 10; 35, 3; 38, 2; 47, 3; 48, 2.
persuadere transit. 44, 3.
persuasio 'conviction' 23, 1.
pervivere intransit. 56, 4.
petitio 'prayer' 9, 4.
philosophatus 3, 2.
philosophia with concrete sense ('the philosophers') 2, 5 (3, 3); ∼ *Plato* 6, 8 (24, 6).
philosophus (-*ia*) especially referring to *Plato* 4; 6, 7; -*i* ∼ *Aristoteles* 10, 5.
plane 6, 5 (2, 1).
plastica (-*e*) 43, 11.
plebs 'community' 9, 4.
 Pleonasm of *et* 1, 6; 8, 1; of *hypoth. clauses* 29, 2; 44, 3; 48, 2; of *adv.* 6, 3; of *ille* 9, 8; of *videri* 52, 2(1, 1); of *etiam* 56, 2; of *dinosci* 17, 11.
 Pluperf. instead of imperf. 9, 8.
 Plural, due to preceding plural 20, 4; 24, 4; 25, 7; 45, 2; 55, 2.
plus est quod 19, 8.
pompa (*diaboli*) 35, 3.
ponere intransit. 42, 1.
popularitas 'population' 30, 2.
populus = *multitudo* 6, 8; = *Israel* 9, 3.
portendere = *significare* 18, 3.
portus, metaphor. use of — 2, 1.
posse = *potens esse* 57, 8; = *esse posse* 18, 7.
posteaquam ∼ *postquam* 34, 2.
postliminium 35, 6.
postumus with *genit.* 17, 12.
potior = *potentior* 18, 10.
prae = *propter* 2, 2.
praecidere 16, 6.
praecipere with *infin.* 20, 3.
praeco = *apostolus* 3, 3.
praecocus 20, 3.
praeesse = *praesto esse* (?) 20, 5.
praeire 43, 7.
praeiudicare de 2, 2; with *dat.* 8, 5.
praeiudicium 2, 5.
praeparatura 43, 9.
praesertim 28, 3.
praesidere 33, 2.
praestantia 2, 6.
praestare with *accus. c. infin.* 51, 3; — *fortem* 34, 4; instead of *se* — 35, 2.
praestruere 18, 5.
praevaticari 1, 6; -*ator* 25, 2.
praevenire transit. 15, 4; with *infin.* 26, 3.
pratum, metaphor. use of — 24, 11.
 Pregnancy: cf. s. v. *adulari* 43, 5; *discruciare* 53, 4; *exacuare* 46, 3; *infamare* 17, 2; *privare* 2, 2; *probator* 43, 7; *stipare* 54, 4.
 Preposition with subst. equivalent to *adject.* 10, 9 (25, 5; 44, 2).
primatus: 'right of primogeniture' 27, 3.
primordium referring to events described in *Genesis* 9, 7 (19, 5; 26, 5; 27, 7; 29, pr.; 36, 4; 43, 11); with *genit. definit.* 19, 5; *a-o* ∼ *de-o* 38, 1.
principale = ἡγεμονικόν 15, 1 (14, 2); -*itas* 13, 1; -*iter* 18, 9.
prior ∼ *proprius* in MSS 38, 6 (41, 3).
priusquam avoided by Tert. 26, 5.
privare = *privum facere* 2, 2; -*atus* 'special' 54, 4.
probator = *probum faciens* 43, 7.
procedere 'to appear' 1, 5; 'to take place' 43, 3.
prodactus 43, 1.
profari = προφητεύειν 43, 9.
professor veritatis, etc. 25, 2.
profuturus = *utilis* 38, 5.
progressior 31, 2.
prohibere = *vetare* 2, 7.
proinde with function of *adject.* 34, 3; two subsequent sentences opened by — 16, 2.
promulgare 46, 6 (11, 3).
propago 2, 6 (19, 6).
prophetia 'Holy Scripture' 4 (2, 3; 2, 4; cf. 28, 1).
propositio 6, 3.
proprietas 3, 1 (9, 5; 21, 4).

- proprius* = *suus* 2, 2.
propter with gerundive 35, 1.
proscribere = *inscribere* 13, 2; = *titulare*, *vocare* 24, 1.
prosector 25, 5.
prospectus with object. genit. 6, 8.
providere = *prae-* 3, 1.
provocare 19, 3.
pthisis 20, 4.
pulsare = *accusare* 20, 3 (40, 4).
pulsus 19, 7.
pupula 10, 5.
puta 'for instance' 56, 5.
pythonici spiritus 28, 5.
qua with causal sense 39, 1.
quaestionem pati 4; -*es* (*in*)*finitae* 2, 7.
quale est, ut 24, 8.
qualiterqualiter ∞ *qualiter* 54, 1.
quam bene = *optime* 45, 4; *quam* instead of *antequam* and *postquam* 56, 2.
quamdiu 'until' 40, 1.
quamquam with subjunct. 38, 1.
quando with adversative force 20, 6.
quanti = *quot* 9, 6.
quatenus = *quoniam* 1, 1.
querella 30, 4.
 Question, *Variatio modorum* in indirect -s 13, 1; indic. in indirect -s 53, 1.
qui instead of *quis* after *si* and *ne* 25, 8.
quia with subjunct. 12, 4; not followed by *verbum finitum* 25, 6; 26, 3; 50, 1.
quicumque 36, 4; 37, 1.
quidni? 6, 6.
quinio 6, 8 (46, 11).
quisque after *posit.* 2, 4; after comparat. 9, 1; after possess. pronoun 35, 6.
quo mihi lapidem?, etc. 25, 6; *quo* = *ex quo* 27, 3.
quod = (or almost =) *sicut* 10, 6; 15, 5; 17, 10; 18, 10; 19, 2; — with subjunct. instead of *accus. c. infin.* 17, 13.
quominus 39, 1.
rapere 25, 2.
ratio circumlocution by means of — 2, 6.
rato fieri (*habere*) 35, 1.
re- meaningless 46, 2 (20, 2).
reatus 'sin' 39, 3.
recenseri = *renasci* 31, 5 (40; 1).
recipere 'to guarantee' 40, 1.
recogitatus 6, 8.
recognoscere 17, 6.
reformari almost = *renasci* 32, 4.
refrigerare intransit. 51, 7.
refrigerium 33, 11.
refundere, metaphor. use of — 33, 2; 48, 2.
 Relative clause instead of hypothet. clause 9, 1 (17, 9; 28, 2; 33, 7; 55, 4); with causal sense, e. g. 30, 1; cf. also 12, 3.
 Relative pronoun, neutr. after masc. or femin. antecedens 25, 3; sg. after plur. antec. 50, 5; cf. also s. v. 'Ellipsis'.
reliquatio 56, 4.
relucere 18, 4.
renidentia 49, 1.
renuntiare diabolo 35, 3.
renuntiator 57, 11.
repastinare 50, 4.
repercutere = *refutare* 23, 6.
 Repetitions in arguments 6, 1; cf. also s. v. 'syllogisms', Ind. III.
repraesentare 57, 12.
repromittere 9, 4.
reputare = *deputare* 12, 6 (46, 3).
res, circumlocution by means of — 11, 5; 20, 3.
rescissio 53, 3.
respicere 'to take into account' 10, 3; = *perspicere* 46, 2.
respondere 'to give an advice' 6, 6 (26, 1); = *spondere* 20, 2.
resumi almost = *renasci* 31, 1.
retractare = *tractare* 16, 3; = *dubitare* 2, 6.
retractatus 2, 6 (46, 1).
retro = *antea* 23, 6.
retundere = *refellere* 3, 3.
revelatio 55, 4 (9, 3).
revincere = *refellere* 25, 3.
revocari = *renasci*, *recenseri* 35, 1.
revolubilis 28, 2.
revolvi referring to metempsychosis 31, 3; -*ere* 'to repeat' 3, 4.
 Rhyme, influence of — on choice of words 10, 6; 24, 5; 32, 6; 43, 12.
romphaea 55, 4.
ruboratus 25, 3.
rupe 6, 7.
sacramentum 1, 4; 9, 4; 11, 4; 18, 4.
saeculum 1, 6.
sagina 48, 2.
salvo eo, ut 18, 6; -*um facere* 13, 3.
sanctificare 26, 5.
sanchus = *mundus* 39, 4.
sanguis ∞ *martyrium* 55, 5.
sapor = *sapere* 12, 5.
satiatissime 46, 11.
scabidus 38, 2.
scena 46, 12; — *corporis* 51, 4.
schisma 3, 1.
schola 1, 6.
secessio 'death' 44, 2.
secreta = *loci muliebres* 25, 5.
secundatus 27, 3.
securus with causat. sense 50, 4.

- sed nec* 15, 5.
segregatio 43, 2.
semel 'once for all' 33, 11.
sepultura = -*crum* 32, 1; = *mortuus* 51, 2.
sequestrare 14, 5.
servare with infin. 47, 3.
si followed by partic. 1, 3; 18, 2;
 — . . . *sed* 32, 9; -*quando* = *aliquando* 18, 9; -*fuisse(n)t* 10, 8; -*forte* 8, 5 (26, 4; 43, 5; 57, 8).
sic . . . *si* 6, 7; — . . . *dum* 8, 2 (17, 3);
 — . . . *quod* 10, 6; — *quoque* 6, 7; 10, 6.
sigillarius motus 6, 3.
signare = *confirmare* 8, 1 (31, 1).
silva = *multitudo* 2, 6 (24, 11).
simpliciter interpretari 35, 2.
singulare 31, 1.
sive 12, 1.
socius 'belonging to a *socius*' 5, 5.
solacium = *auxilium* 7, 1.
solidus 'complete' 57, 12.
sollemnis 27, 5.
sollicitus = *intentus* 53, 5.
solummodo 10, 2.
somniare referring to pagan philosophers 28, 5.
somnus: *in -is* = *in -iis* 9, 8.
sonat de plaustro 17, 3.
sophista 28, 2 (3, 3).
sopitus 'deceased' 57, 2.
sors 11, 6 (20, 6; 43, 9).
sortiri with infin. 8, 4.
sperare = *expectare* 35, 5 (56, 6).
statio 43, 4; — *sensuum* 48, 2.
status 4; 11, 1.
sternere viam 16, 5.
stilus = *liber* 52, 3.
stipare, pregnant sense of — 54, 4.
strophæ 28, 4.
structus (subst.) 18, 5.
struere = *instruere* 10, 3 (2, 2; 5, 3; 10, 7).
stupidus with object. genit. 26, 4.
suasoriae 56, 2.
sub indicating time 48, 1 (55, 4).
subdivalis 55, 1.
subiacere with dat. 18, 3.
subjunctive: *potentialis* 9, 4; *quod dicendum sit* 18, 2; *quod faciat ad* 38, 1.
sublimare 54, 2.
sublimitas = *altitudo* 9, 1.
subornare 2, 4.
subostendere 12, 3.
subremanere 18, 10.
subscribere = *dare, concedere* 40, 4.
substantia . . . *opera* 11, 1 (14, 4).
 Substantives with function of adjct.:
adulatrix 51, 4; *augur* 19, 8 (24, 10);
aversatrix 51, 4; *avocatrix* 1, 5;
candidatus 39, 2; *coetaneus* 31, 2;
debitrix 35, 4; *decurialis* 37, 3;
dissolutrix 42, 1; *divinatrix* 22, 2;
dominatrix 22, 2; *famulus* 33, 9;
femina 36, 3; *ianitrix* 55, 4; *mas* 36, 3; *operatrix* 11, 4; *peremptrix* 42, 1; *præiudicatrix* 46, 8; *soror* 52, 3.
succidere ∞ *succedere* in MSS 34, 3; 43, 5.
succussus 49, 1.
suffundor = *pudet me* 38, 2; -*usior* 38, 2.
suffusio 'fusion' 36, 4.
suggestus 1, 1; 12, 1.
sulcus = *vulva* 27, 8.
sumere 'to obtain' 9, 4 (22, 2; 50, 5).
summus = *supremus* 53, 4.
supercælestis 23, 3.
superducere almost = *addere* 25, 6.
superest with infin. or subjunct. 43, 5.
superfluum 'remainder' 51, 4.
supparare 25, 9 (30, 5).
suppelleæ referring to the body 40, 3.
suspendere 52, 2; = *torquere* 18, 7.
sustinere = *expectare* 56, 3; -*eri* followed by *nomin. c. infin.* 56, 4.
suus referring to logical subject 2, 5; = *proprius* 18, 11.
tam: *non* = *non magnopere, non vehementer* 33, 5.
tantundem (adv.) 8, 5.
tantus: *non* = *non valde magnus* 33, 5 (cf. 41, 2); -*i* = *tot* 6, 7.
taxare = *accusare* 49, 2.
temperare 10, 3; ∞ *interpretari* 35, 2.
temperius 36, 4.
tempus with genit. 1, 2.
tenere with *accus. c. inf.* 28, 3; -*eri* = *cogi* 45, 1.
tenor 3, 2.
terminus 26, 1.
thamnus, cf. s. v. 'Ambiguity'.
the(n)saurus 15, 4.
tibicinare 'to support' 38, 5.
titulare 13, 1.
titulus 2, 5; = *liber* 3, 4 (20, 5); *in cella meretricis* 34, 4.
traditor 'traitor' 11, 5.
traducere = *coarguere* or 'to ridicule' 1, 5.
tradux 9, 6.
transactio = *consummatio* 55, 3.
transgressio 16, 1; -*or* 35, 3.
transigere with *ablat.* = *degere, vivere* 49, 2.
translatio 32, 4.
transvenire 23, 6.
trinitas 16, 4.
trinus = *triplex* 48, 3.

- tunc* with function of adjunct. 1, 2 (31, 4; 36, 4).
tutus with causat. sense 50, 4.
uncus 33, 6; — *hebes* 25, 5.
unde: — *illis animam?* 25, 6 (19, 9); ∞ *undeunde* 51, 8.
ungen 46, 8.
unio = *unitas* 13, 3.
unire 17, 6.
ὕψ' ἔν 2, 5; 44, 3.
usque adv. 25, 3; 31, 1; prepos. 46, 6; -ad 'even' 11, 5.
usus (ac) *fructus* 54, 3.
ut with explicat. force 8, 2; instead of — ... *ita* 26, 4; — ... *scilicet* 24, 6; -*ne* 44, 2; cf. also s. vv. *consequens*, *ineptus*, *magis*, *qualis*, *vanus*.
uterque = *utervis* 11, 6; plur. after — 38, 5.
uterus = *partus* 6, 8.
uti, absolute use of — 9, 8.
vacare 'to be idle' 12, 5 (44, 1); -*ab* 45, 1.
valentia 20, 4.
valetudo 6, 8.
vanum (*est*), *ut* 56, 3.
'Variatio': of tenses 2, 2; 30, 1; 57, 4; of moods 10, 2; 13, 1; 51, 8; of act. and pass. infin. 46, 13; of adjunct. and genit. 26, 1; of genit. and dat. 51, 4; of ablat. and *de* 2, 1; of *penes* and *apud* 14, 2; of cases of gerund 24, 6; of expressions 16, 2; 27, 4.
vectaculum 53, 3.
vectari, metaphor. use of — 15, 2.
vegetare 25, 2.
velitari, metaphor. use of — 1, 2.
velle: *velis* (ac) *nolis* 58, 1.
veneficium = *magia* 2, 5.
venire = *evenire* 53, 5; -*ab* (*de*, *ex*) 1, 4.
ventilari 15, 5.
vernaculus with genit. 51, 6.
vernum = *ver* 48, 1.
vesperugo = *vespertilio* 32, 3.
vesticeps 56, 5.
vestire, metaphor. use of — 2, 5; 17, 6.
via vitalis 53, 2.
vicem, ad — with genit. 57, 3.
videre: — *erit* 'does not matter' 2, 6 (10, 1).
viduare with ablat. 19, 1.
vigor = *τόνος* 43, 2 (48, 1); ∞ *rigor* 3, 2.
vindicare, construction of — 1, 3 (9, 1; 11, 1; 15, 2).
vir = *τὰ αἰδοῖα* 33, 5.
viriosus 19, 4.
virtus 'magical power' 34, 2.
virus = *semen* 27, 6.
vis, circumlocution by means of —, 19, 3.
viscera terrae 55, 1.
visualitas 29, 3.
Vitellii commentarii 46, 7.
vivacitas 25, 3.

V. EDITIONS OF TERTULLIAN'S WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE COMMENTARY

Passages in C.S.E.L. 20 and 47 are referred to by the numbers of book (if necessary), chapter, page and line on the page, passages in C.S.E.L. 70 are indicated only by the numbers of book, chapter, and line in the chapter.

<i>ad mart.</i> = <i>Ad martyras</i>	Ed.: Oehler.
<i>ad nat.</i> = <i>Ad nationes</i>	J. G. Ph. Borleffs, Leyden 1929.
<i>ad Scap.</i> = <i>Ad Scapulam</i>	Oehler.
<i>ad ux.</i> = <i>Ad uxorem</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>adv. Herm.</i> = <i>Adversus Hermogenem</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
<i>adv. Iud.</i> = <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>adv. Marc.</i> = <i>Adversus Marcionem</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
[<i>adv. omn. haer.</i> = <i>Adversus omnes haereses</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.]
<i>adv. Praex.</i> = <i>Adversus Praean</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
<i>adv. Val.</i> = <i>Adversus Valentinianos</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
<i>apol.</i> = <i>Apologeticum</i>	J. Martin, Bonn 1933.
<i>bapt.</i> = <i>De baptismo</i>	J. G. Ph. Borleffs, Mnemos., N.S. 59 (1931), 1/47.
<i>c. Chr.</i> = <i>De carne Christi</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>cor.</i> = <i>De corona</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>cult. fem.</i> = <i>De cultu feminarum</i>	W. Kok, Dokkum 1934.
<i>exh. cast.</i> = <i>De exhortatione castitatis</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>fuga</i> = <i>De fuga in persecutione</i>	J. J. Thierry, Hilversum 1941.
<i>idol.</i> = <i>De idololatria</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>iei.</i> = <i>De ieiunio</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>mon.</i> = <i>De monogamia</i>	Oehler.
<i>orat.</i> = <i>De oratione</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>paen.</i> = <i>De paenitentia</i>	J. G. Ph. Borleffs, Mnemos., N.S. 60 (1932), 256/273.
<i>pall.</i> = <i>De pallio</i>	A. Gerlo, Wetteren 1940.
<i>pat.</i> = <i>De patientia</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
<i>praescr.</i> = <i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 70.
<i>pud.</i> = <i>De pudicitia</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>res.</i> = <i>De resurrectione carnis</i>	Kroymann, C.S.E.L. 47.
<i>scorp.</i> = <i>Scorpiace</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>spect.</i> = <i>De spectaculis</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>test. anim.</i> = <i>De testimonio animae</i>	Reifferscheid-Wissowa, C.S.E.L. 20.
<i>v.v.</i> = <i>De virginibus velandis</i>	Oehler.

T denotes a word occurring in Tert.'s works *only*, Tp a word found in Tert. *for the first time*.

ERRATA TO THE ORIGINAL EDITION

Typographical errors in *De anima*, identified by E.P. Meijering

p. 2, 6:	after <i>ipsa</i> insert <i>morte</i>	
p. 4, r. 3 from top:	regula	> regulae
p. 22, r. 14:	rebis	> rebus
p. 71, r. 18:	at the end incorrect spacing between words and commas	
p. 73, r. 21:	at the beginning incorrect spacing	
p. 103, r. 19 from top:	probably	> probable
p. 154, r. 9 from top:	“the soul should be regarded as corporeal”:	
	corporeal	> incorporeal
p. 180, r. 5 from bottom:	§ 3	> § 5
p. 199, r. 9 from top:	ἀλλ’ ὅτι	> ἀλλ’ ὅτι
p. 203, r. 17 from top:	τῆς	> τῆς
p. 203, r. 20 from bottom:	φησὶ	> φησι
p. 203, r. 5 from bottom:	ἀλλ’ ἔοικε	> ἀλλ’ ἔοικε
p. 205, r. 8 from bottom:	causem	> causam
p. 211, r. 14 from top:	καθ’ ὁρμὴν	> καθ’ ὁρμὴν
p. 211, r. 16 from top:	ορμὴν	> ὁρμὴν
p. 215, r. 12 from top:	ἐνεργεῖαι	> ἐνεργεῖαι
p. 215, r. 15 from top:	ἐνεργεῖαν	> ἐνεργεῖαν
p. 220, r. 21 from bottom:	κατ’ αὐτόν	> κατ’ αὐτόν
p. 220, r. 20 from bottom:	τῆς	> τῆς
p. 221, r. 14 from bottom:	κεφάλην	> κεφαλὴν
p. 223, r. 23 from bottom:	φεύγοντα	> φεύγοντα
p. 241, r. 7 from top:	τὴν τε	> τὴν τε
p. 259, r. 10 from bottom:	Juristenteksten	> Juristentexte
p. 262, r. 19 from bottom:	Erkenntnis	> Erkenntnis
p. 306, r. 18 from bottom:	supposin	> supposing
p. 329, final sentence:	τινες	> τινές
p. 333 r. 3 from top:	εἴπερ ἐστὶ	> εἴπερ ἐστὶ
p. 349, r. 5 from bottom:	ἡμιν	> ἡμῖν
p. 357, r. 8 from bottom:	ὦν	> ὦν
p. 403, r. 14 from bottom:	δέ,	> δέ,
p. 411, r. 23 from bottom:	μία	> μιᾷ
p. 426, r. 14 from bottom:	το	> τὸ
p. 430, r. 17 from bottom:	Ἀριστέλης	> Ἀριστοτέλης
p. 434, r. 5 from top:	δεύτερα	> δευτέρα
p. 449, r. 4 from bottom:	unaccurate	> inaccurate
p. 462, r. 5 from top:	μέρων	> μερῶν
p. 465, r. 12 from top:	οὔ	> οὐ

p. 474, r. 2 from top:	σκίαν	>	σκιάν
p. 480, r. 9 from top:	ὑφ' ἔν	>	ὑφ' ἔν
p. 483, r. 14 from top:	סדרת	>	סדרת
p. 487, r. 12 from top:	λόγισμοῦ	>	λογισμοῦ
p. 507, r. 13 from bottom:	ὄψε	>	ὄψε
p. 515, r. 18 from top:	ὄψε	>	ὄψε
p. 520, r. 7 from bottom:	spacing between ἐστὲ and ἔν Χριστῷ		
p. 532, r. 2 from bottom:	εἰρηνοποιεῖν	>	εἰρηνοποιεῖν
p. 539, r. 3 from bottom:	to takes	>	to take
p. 546, r. 19 from bottom:	ἀγγέλους	>	ἀγγέλους
p. 549, r. 26 from bottom:	ταύτη	>	ταύτη
p. 585, r. 30 from bottom:	τὸ δ'	>	τὸ δ'